

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

CHARLES R ANDERSON

KEMP MALONE

DON CAMERON ALLEN

VOLUME LXIV

1949

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1949

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXIV

	PAGE
Pyles, Thomas, Innocuous Linguistic Indecorum a Semantic Byway,	1
Stroud, T A, Manly's Marginal Notes on the 'Piers Plowman' Con- troversy	9
Baum, P F, <i>The Man of Law's Tale</i>	12
Emery, Clark, Dr Johnson on Dr Hill	15
Loftis, John, Steele and the Drury Lane Patent	19
Cordasco, Francesco, Smollett and the Death of King William III	21
Wasserman, E R, Another Eighteenth Century Distinction between Fancy and Imagination	23
Ward, W S, Lord Byron and "My Grandmother's Review"	25
Coe, C N, Wordsworth's Debt to Laborde's <i>View of Spain</i>	29
Coe, C N, Wordsworth's "The Russian Fugitive"	31
Coe, C N, A Note on Wordsworth's "A Morning Exercise," 1-18	36
Long, E H, Sut Lovingood and Mark Twain's <i>Joan of Arc</i>	37
Clavería, Carlos, <i>Gunpa</i>	39
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Casket, Cask</i>	44
Albrecht, E A, Geoffroy Saint Hilaire a Translator of Goethe?	47
Pike, R E, A Contemporary Judgment on Moliere	49
Pike, R E, Racine et "Le Cocuage de Molière"	51
Françon, Marcel, La Fee Morgain et les <i>Chroniques gargantues</i>	52
Gohn, E S, A Note on Spenser's Use of Trope	53
Long, R A, John Heywood, Chaucer, and Lydgate	55
Ziegler, Julian, Two Notes on J T Williams' "Words into Images in Chaucer's <i>Hous of Fame</i> "	73
Pratt, R A, The Classical Lamentations in the <i>Nun's Priest's Tale</i>	76
Boone, Lalia Phipps, Chauntecleer and Partlet Identified	78
Kirby, T A, Further Seventeenth Century Allusions	81
Wintermute, Edwin, The <i>Pearl's</i> Author as Herbalist	83
Watson, M R, The Chronology of <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i>	85
Marquardt, W F, A Source for the Passage on the Origin of Chess in Lydgate's <i>Troy Book</i>	87
Kokeritz, Helge, 'Out Born' in <i>Ludus Coventriae</i>	88
Schoeck, R J, Alliteration as a means of Staza Connection in <i>The Faerie Queene</i>	90
Allen, D C, On the Closing Lines of <i>The Faerie Queene</i>	93
Thomas, Sidney, A Note on <i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>	94
Schultz, Howard, Warlike Flutes Gellius, Castiglione, Montaigne, and Milton	96
Mooney, E A, Jr, A Note on Astronomy in Tennyson's <i>The Princess</i>	98
Dickinson, L T, The Sources of <i>The Prince and the Pauper</i>	103
Shannon, E F, Jr, The Coachman's Part in the Publication of <i>Poems by Two Brothers</i>	107

	PAGE
Fucilla, J G, Notes on Hispanic Poetry	110
Carter, A E, Tourgueneff's New Year's Greeting to Flaubert	115
Hillway, Tytus, Melville's Use of Two Pseudo Sciences	145
Artinian, Artine, New Light on the Maupassant Family	150
Douglas, K N, Stanza Three of Paul Valery's "Cimetiere marin"	156
Vartanian, Aram, Elie Luzac's Refutation of La Mettrie	159
Place, Edwin B, Once More, <i>Duendal</i>	161
Levy, Raphael, L'Emploi du mot <i>desport</i> dans <i>Lucassin et Nicolette</i>	164
Auerbach, Erich, Rising to Christ on the Cross (<i>Paradiso</i> , XI, 70-72)	166
Lang, C Y, Swinburne on Keats a Fragment of an Essay	168
Nicholes, E L, The "Simile of the Sparrow" in <i>The Rainbow</i> by D H Lawrence	171
Laverty, C D, A Note on Poe in 1838	174
Lang, C Y, A Further Note on Swinburne and Whitman	176
Bandy, W T, A Misdated Swinburne Letter	177
White, William, An Armenian Performance of Shelley's <i>The Cenci</i>	178
Allen, D C, A Note on <i>Comus</i>	179
Wormhoudt, Arthur, A Note on William Law's <i>The Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage Entertainment</i>	180
Françon, Marcel, Les Lamentations de Jérémie et la poésie française du XVI ^e siècle	181
Steinhauer, H, Eros and Psyche a Nietzschean Motif in Anglo American Literature	217
Ford, Newell F, Keats's "O for a Life of Sensations"	229
Herbert, T Walter, Shakespeare's Word-Play on <i>Tombe</i>	235
Heflin, Wilson L, Melville's Third Whaler	241
Chambers, Frank M, The Troubadours and the Assassins	245
Carpenter, Nan Cooke, Rabelais and the Greek Dances	251
Fairchild, Hoxie N, "Wild Bells" in Bailey's <i>Festus</i> ?	256
Jeremy, Sister Mary, Caxton's Additions to the <i>Legenda Aurca</i>	259
French, W H, Medieval Chess and the <i>Book of the Duchess</i>	261
Spargo, John Webster, Chaucer's <i>Kankedort</i> [<i>Troilus and Criseyde</i> II, 1752]	264
Auerbach, Erich, Saul's Pride (<i>Purg</i> XII 40-42)	267
Adrian, Arthur A, The Cheeryble Brothers a Further Note	269
Fussell, Paul, Jr, A Note on <i>The Windhover</i>	271
Bowen, W H, Further Note on the Thirty Points of Woman's Beauty	272
Johnson, Maurice, The Ghost of Swift in <i>Four Quartets</i>	273
Baum, Paul F, Poe's <i>To Helen</i>	289
Levin, Harry, An Echo from <i>The Spanish Tragedy</i>	297
Thompson, Francis J, Unity in <i>The Second Shepherd's Tale</i>	302
Severs, J Burke, Two Irregular Chaucerian Stanzas	306
Past, Ramond E, A Note on <i>The Rhythm of Beowulf</i>	310
Smith, Roland M, Anglo-Saxon Spinsters and Anglo-Saxon Archers (Two Steps towards a Study in Extension)	312
Blenner-Hassett, R, Geoffrey of Monmouth and Milton's <i>Comus</i>	315

CONTENTS

V

	PAGE
Thomas, Sidney, The Bad Weather in <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	319
Pyles, Thomas, Ophelia's "Nothing"	322
Artinian, Artine, Maupassant's Paris Addresses	323
Bishop, Robert K, A Preliminary Note on Goethe and Andre Gide	326
Hammond, John H, A Plagiarism from Quevedo's <i>Sueños</i>	329
Lapp, John C, Pontus de Tyard and the <i>Querelle des femmes</i>	331
Chambers, Frank M, <i>Us jous novels, complitz de grans beutatz</i>	333
Robertson, D W, Jr, Marie de France, <i>Lais</i> , Prologue, 13 16	336
Françon, Marcel, Jean Lemaire et la complainte de Marguerite d'Autriche sur la mort de son père	338
Francis, W Nelson, Chaucer's "Airish Beasts"	339
Braddy, Haldeen, Chaucer's Philippa, Daughter of Panneto	342
Sherbo, Arthur, A Note on <i>The Man of Mode</i>	343
Turner, W Arthur, Milton's Aid to the <i>Polyglott Bible</i>	345
Prescott, Joseph, James Joyce's Epiphanies	346
Einaisson, Stefán, <i>Beowulf</i> 249 <i>White</i> = Icelandic <i>Lutr</i>	347
Kurrelmeyer, W, Wielands Briefwechsel mit Du Vau	361
Schirokauer, Aino, Die Reimsprache des <i>Turkenkalender</i>	372
Wherlow, S N, The "Brown Night" in the German Baroque	380
Salinger, Herman, Mathilde Heine's Album	387
Jessen, Myra R, Ein Berliner 'Sperl' bei Fontane	391
Krumpelmann, J T, Lessing's <i>Faust Fragment</i> and <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	395
Drake, Patricia, Grillparzer's Self Identification with Rousseau	398
Weimeich, M I, Ideological Antecedents of the <i>Brothers Karamasov</i>	400
Frank, John G, A Note on the Natural Bridge in <i>Atala</i>	406
O'Brien, Justin, Marcel Proust's Maxims Again	410
Tucker, J E, The Earliest English Translation of La Rochefoucauld's <i>Maximes</i>	413
Anderson, Viola H, Othello and Peregrina, "Richer than All His Tribe"	415
Thomas, Sidney, The Earthquake in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	417
Nichol, J W, Dame Mary Etherege	419
Turner, Alberta, The University Miscellanies Some Neglected Early Texts of Cleveland and Cowley	423
Bart, B F, A Misdated Flaubert Letter	425
Hatcher, Anna Granville, To Get/Be Invited	433
Deierkauf Holsboer, S Wilma, Trois Querelles et leurs renseigne- ments pour l'histoire du théâtre français au XVII ^e siècle	446
Bowers, R H, Middle-English Poems by Mydwynter	454
Beall, C B, A Quaint Conceit from Guarini to Dryden	461
Schutz, A H, Old Provençal "nozol"	468
Schweitzer, J W, Georges de Scudéry and Antoine Godeau	471
Pitou, Spue, Richelet, Forerunner of Samuel Johnson, and de Lormes	474
Crocker, L G, A Note on Diderot and Patriotism	476
Allen, D C, John Donne and the Tower of Babel	481
Juergensen, Hans, Die Mutter in Adalbert Stifters Werken	483
Sturtevant, A M, Etymologies of Old Norse Proper Names Used as Poetic Designations	486

	PAGE
Selmer, Carl, An Unnoticed Middle Bavarian Prose Version of Pseudo-Aristotelian Proverbs	491
Forchheimer, Paul, <i>Klar wie Klossbruch</i>	493
Waith, E M, The Sources of <i>The Double Marriage</i> by Fletcher and Massinger	505
Smith, Warren, The Third Type of Aside in Shakespeare	510
Simonini, R C, Jr, The Pedant and Church in <i>Twelfth Night</i> , III n 80	513
Nyland, W S, Pompey as the Mythical Lover of Cleopatra	515
Bowers, Fredson, Thomas Dekker, Robert Wilson, and <i>The Shoe makers Holiday</i>	517
Perkinson, Richard H, The Body as a Triangular Structure in Spenser and Chapman	520
Kelley, Maurice, Dannel Skinner, Lord Preston, and Milton's commonplace Book	522
Svendsen, Kester, Milton's "Aerie Microscope"	525
Evans, G Blakemore, Milton and Lee's <i>The Rival Queens</i> (1677)	527
Adams, Henry Hitch, A Note on the Date of a Dryden Letter	528
Malone, Kemp, Some Linguistic Studies of 1945-1948	532

REVIEWS

Leo Spitzer, Linguistics and Literary History Essays in Stylistics [Fernand Baldensperger]	56
C G Osgood, H G Lotspiech and D E Mason (eds) The Works of Edmund Spenser The Minor Poems Vol II [G R Potter]	60
Northrop Frye, Fearful Symmetry, A Study of William Blake [René Wellek]	62
W W Beyer, Keats and the Daemon King [N F Ford]	63
J G Southworth, The Poetry of Thomas Hardy [W Y Tindall]	65
H C Webster, On a Darkling Plain [W Y Tindall]	66
Lewis Leary (ed), Articles on American Literature Appearing in Current Periodicals, 1920-1945 [R H Pearce]	67
F O Matthiessen, The James Family, F O Matthiessen and K B Murdock (eds), The Notebooks of Henry James [Quentin Anderson]	116
Sister Miriam Joseph, C S C, Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language [T W Baldwin]	120
Paul Rayher, Essai sur les Idées dans l'œuvre de Shakespeare [R E Davril]	122
L L Schucking, Shakespeare und der Tragödienstil seiner Zeit. [O E Schoen-René]	124
Rosemond Tuve, Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery [M. T Herrick]	125
Una Ellis Fermor, The Frontiers of Drama [P H Kocher]	127
A H Gilbert, On the Composition of 'Paradise Lost' [J S Drekhoff]	129

CONTENTS

vii

	PAGE
D L Clark, John Milton at St Paul's School [<i>F M Krouse</i>]	130
Robert Halsband (ed), <i>The Nonsense of Common Sense</i> by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu [<i>Rae Blanchard</i>]	132
Freda L Townsend, Apologie for "Bartholmew Fayre," The Art of Jonson's Comedies [<i>D O Boughner</i>]	135
G W Knight, The Crown of Life Essays in Interpretation of Shakespeare's Final Plays [<i>B C West</i>]	137
Werner Klemm, Die Englische Farce im 19 Jahrhundert [<i>N B Fagin</i>]	139
Ilse Gugler, Das Problem der Fragmentarischen Dichtung in der Englischen Romantik [<i>Ernest Bernbaum</i>]	140
L V D H Hammond, Laurence Sterne's Sermons of Mr Yorick [<i>M R Grennan</i>]	141
David Diringer, The Alphabet a Key to the History of Mankind [<i>W F Albright</i>]	182
A H J Knight, Heinrich Julius Duke of Brunswick [<i>E Feise</i>]	185
Ernst Beutler, Essays um Goethe [<i>E Feise</i>]	187
E Rickert, C C Olson, M M Crow, M Rickert (eds), Chaucer's World [<i>K Malone</i>]	189
F P Wilson and B Dobrée (eds), The Oxford History of English Literature, Vol II, Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century, by H S Bennett, The Close of the Middle Ages, by E K Chambers [<i>K Malone</i>]	190
C W Jones, Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England [<i>K Malone</i>]	192
Fernand Mossé, Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue anglaise [<i>S Emarsson</i>]	193
G Le Gentil, Fernão Mendes Pinto Un précurseur de l'exotisme au XVI ^e siècle [<i>F M Rogers</i>]	194
T G Bergin and M H Fisch (trs), The New Science of Giambattista Vico [<i>E Auerbach</i>]	196
Angelina La Piana, Dante's American Pilgrimage A Historical Survey of Dante Studies in the U S, 1800-1944 [<i>C S Singleton</i>]	198
Sister Mary C Costello, Between Fixity and Flux, A Study of the Concept of Poetry in the Criticism of T S Eliot [<i>K Shapiro</i>]	199
Sister Marcella M Holloway, The Prosodic Theory of Gerard Manley Hopkins [<i>K Shapiro</i>]	200
Paul Van Tieghem, Le Prérromantisme La Découverte de Shakespeare sur le continent [<i>H C Lancaster</i>]	201
Mario Praz, Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery II A Bibliography of Emblem Books [<i>K L Selig</i>]	203
V L Parrington, Jr, American Dreams A Study of American Utopias, M C Park, Joseph Priestley and the Problem of Pantheocracy [<i>W F Taylor</i>]	204
L B Wallis, Fletcher, Beaumont & Company [<i>B Maxwell</i>]	206
A J A Waldock, "Paradise Lost" and its Critics [<i>E M Pope</i>]	208

	PAGE
W F Michael, Die geistlichen Prozessionsspiele in Deutschland [M Blakemore Evans]	273
Georg Lukács, Goethe und seine Zeit [Ernst Feise]	275
Carlos Baker, Shelley's Major Poetry [F L Jones]	278
Jean Lemaire de Belges, <i>La concorde des deux langages</i> , ed Jean Frappier, <i>Les épîtres de l'amant vert</i> , ed Jean Frappier [Marcel Françon]	280
May, Georges, Tragedie cornélienne, Tragedie racinienne [H C Lancaster]	282
Norman Lacey, Wordsworth's View of Nature [J Q Wolf, Jr.]	284
H C Berkowitz, Perez Galdós, Spanish Liberal Crusader [D F Brown]	286
Gerald Bullett, George Eliot Her Life and Books [C F Harold]	347
W S Lewis (ed.), The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspon- dence, Vols XIII and XIV [R K Root]	349
Kenneth Allott (ed.), The Poems of William Habington [H C Combs]	351
Eugenio Garin, Der italienische Humanismus [N Orsini]	352
C B Tinker, Essays in Retrospect Collected Articles and Addresses [B H Lehman]	353
Mario Pei, French Precursors of the <i>Chanson de Roland</i> [A G Hatcher]	354
E N Dilworth, The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence Sterne. [Lodwick Hartley]	356
R B Heilman, This Great Stage Image and Structure in <i>King Lear</i> [Alfred Harbage]	357
L W Forster, Georg Rudolf Weckherlin Zur Kenntnis seines Lebens In England [G F Merkel]	425
E L Stahl, The Dramas of Heinrich von Kleist [J C Blankenagel]	428
Reinhold Schneider, Dämonie und Verklärung, Rudolf Kassner, Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert, Ausdruck und Grosse [W Paulsen]	430
Vera E Smalley, The Sources of <i>A Dictionary of the French and English Tongues</i> , by Randle Cotgrave [Raphael Levy]	431
Solomon Liptzin, Germany's Stepchildren [Harry Steinhauser]	494
Harry Slochower, No Voice Is Wholly Lost [Harry Steinhauser]	497
Donald W Lee, Functional Change in Early English [Stefan Ewars- son]	498
R M Lumiansky (tr.), <i>The Canterbury Tales</i> of Geoffrey Chaucer Preface by Mark Van Doren [H R Patch]	500
Bernhard Seuffert (ed.), Prolegomena zu einer Wieland Ausgabe VIII Briefwechsel [W Kurrelmeyer]	574
Edward K Brown, Matthew Arnold A Study in Conflict. [William Blackburn]	575

BRIEF MENTION

	PAGE
J D Wilson (ed), <i>Macbeth</i> By William Shakespeare [Charlton Hinman]	69
Elizabeth Mignon, Crabbed Age and Youth The Old Men and Women in the Restoration Comedy of Manners [Charlton Hinman]	69
James L Clifford (ed), Dr Campbell's Diary of a Visit to England in 1775 [Martin Kallich]	142
Virgil B Heltzel, Fair Rosamond A Study of the Development of a Literary Theme [George B Parks]	143
George Coffin Taylor, Essays of Shakespeare an arrangement [D C Allen]	144
Mabel Cotterell (tr), August Closs (introd), Novalis, <i>Hymns to the Night</i> [Ernst Fenske]	209
E Cassirer, P O Kristeller, J H Randall, Jr (eds), The Renaissance Philosophy of Man [Edward Williamson]	210
E K Chambers, Matthew Arnold A Study [Lloyd Davidson]	211
W M Gibson and George Arms, A Bibliography of William Dean Howells [T H Johnson]	212
Helena Watts Baum, The Satiric and Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy [F R Johnson]	213
Georges Bonnard (ed), <i>Troilus and Criseyde</i> By Geoffrey Chaucer [T A Kirby]	213
C A Christensen (ed), <i>Adami Bremensis Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum</i> [Kemp Malone]	214
Myles Dillon (ed), The Cycles of the Kings [Kemp Malone]	214
Laura Keele, Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers, 1300 1500 [Kemp Malone]	215
André Martinet, Initiation pratique à l'anglais [Stefan Einarsson]	215
Philip M Marsh (ed), Monroe's Defense of Jefferson and Freneau against Hamilton [C S Campbell, Jr]	215
Nathan Resnick, Walt Whitman and the Authorship of <i>The Good Gray Poet</i> [G W Allen]	287
Floris Delattre (introd), Camille Chemin (tr), <i>Les Chansons éliزابéthaines</i> [D C Allen]	287
S W Jones (tr), Gleb Struve (introd), N K Gudzy, History of Early Russian Literature. [H C Lancaster]	358
J G McManaway, G E Dawson, and E E Willoughby (eds), Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies [D C Allen]	359
A Davenport (ed), William Rankins, <i>Seven Satires</i> (1598) [Audrey Chew]	359
Unesco Book Coupons [The Editors]	360
<i>Comparative Literature</i> [The Editors]	360
Louis Segal, New Complete English Russian Dictionary [H C Lancaster]	360
Carl Seelig (ed), Georg Buchner, <i>Gesammelte Werke</i> [Wolfgang Paulsen]	501
The World of Learning [H C Lancaster]	502

CORRESPONDENCE

	PAGE
Roland M Smith, Gernemuße and the Benighted "Geography of the Minstrels "	70
Archei Taylor, <i>Dignitas</i> in Otfrid, <i>Ad Luitbertum</i>	144
C U Faye, The Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada	216
J R Hendrickson, An Ambassador	288
J R Hendrickson, Catullus à la Wilder	288
Leo Spitzer, <i>Kanke(r)dort</i> 'a State of Suspense, a Difficult Position '	502
Eugenio Garin, Reply to Professor Orsini	504
Erratum "	576

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

JANUARY, 1949

Number 1

INNOCUOUS LINGUISTIC INDECORUM A SEMANTIC BYWAY

There can be no doubt, as the *NED* points out, that Browning's use of the plural form of a word ordinarily taboo in polite literature, as always in polite society, in *Pippa Passes*, IV, II, 96 ("Then, owls and bats,/ Cows and twats")¹ is a reflection of the lines in *Vanity of Vanities* (1660) "They talk't of his having a Cardinalls Hat,/ They'd send him as soon an Old Nuns Twat" The word in question, rhiming in present English with *what* rather than as Browning's lines would indicate, was commonly used for *puerile muliebre* in the bawdy talk of schoolboys in my childhood, and may still be so used for all I know² Browning's usage does more credit

¹ If Browning's use of *twat* is, as Eric Partridge calls it, "the literary world's worst 'brick'" (*A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, New York, 1937, p. 919), George Meredith's use of *vertep* (i.e. "farteth") in his parody of "Sumer Is Icumen In" in *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*, Chapter XXV, and his later use of the participial form *verting* in the same chapter, must surely run Browning a close second. See in this connection E. E. Ericson, "Bullock Sterteþ, Bucke Verteþ," *MLN*, LIII (1938), 112-113, and the remonstrance of T. C. Hoepfner in *Explicator*, III (Dec. 1944), 18, as well as the contributions of Huntington Brown and J. S. Kenyon, *ibid.*, III (Feb. 1945), 34, and III (Mar. 1945), 40, both of whom support Ericson and the *NED*. Mr. Hoepfner re-entered the lists, *ibid.*, III (June 1945), 59, still unconvinced.

In this connection, the "brick" dropped by Captain Marryat in Chapter XX of *Peter Simple* is worthy of mention. "O'Brien declared that he was a liar, and a cowardly *foutre*." For further comment on *foutre*, see *infra*, note 13. It is highly doubtful that the Puritan dandy, Nathaniel Parker Willis, had this passage in mind when he wrote, in a letter to the *New York Mirror* (18 April 1835) "Captain Marryat's gross trash sells immensely about Wapping and Portsmouth," a statement which was to precipitate the famous bloodless duel of Willis and Marryat.

² In some sections, I am informed, the word now denotes the buttocks of

to his breadth of reading than to his comprehension of the vernacular of venery G B Woods explains the word in a footnote to the Browning poem as "part of a nun's garb, corresponding to the cowl of a monk,"³ which is almost certainly what Browning thought it meant.⁴

It is less easy to demonstrate how other verbal indecencies penetrate into the language of ordinary, informal speech, as *twat* may be said to have entered the language of polite literature in Browning's usage (though it has not, so far as I know, made any headway). Frequently, I suspect, the indecency is introduced as a daringly conscious *double entente* for the purpose of "getting a laugh" from the knowing, and is repeated and disseminated in all innocence by good, douce people.

The semantic shift of *puss*, once synonymous with *twat*, to "mouth, face" may perhaps be so explained.⁵ To decadent middle

either sex, a somewhat meliorative development comparable, indeed identical, to the moving rearward and loss of sexual discrimination in *funny* (cf Partridge, *op cit*, p 265), now a "cute" euphemism in the social intercourse of respectability. Vice versa, *tail* and *arse* (i e ass) seem to have shifted frontwards, though they frequently include the entire female sacro public region—in a loose sense, of course (Cf the vulgar "piece of _____" and see C E Jones, "Chaucer's *Taillynge Ynough*," *MLN*, LII [1937], 570)

³ *Poetry of the Victorian Period* (New York, 1930), p 189

⁴ The late Professor B L Gildersleeve, who took a consistently lofty moral stand on the subject of Browning, did not think the poet so innocent, accusing him of frequent salacity (*AJP*, XXXI [1910], 488-489, XXXII [1911], 484). But worst of all is that "notorious word which smirches the skirt of Pippa Passes" (*ibid*, XXXII, 241)

⁵ A E Hutson, "Gaelic Loan Words in American," *American Speech*, XXII (1947), 21, points out that *puss*, meaning "face," is derived from Irish *pus*, meaning "mouth." Although this Gaelic etymology may account for the introduction of the word in its innocent sense, there can be no doubt of its double associations for many as it is now used. The embarrassed titters and the uninhibited guffaws with which its use is likely to be greeted cannot be accounted for by any theory that it is thought of as a " quaint " Irish word.

I have long been tantalized by the possibility that *puss* in its venereal sense may have developed from *purse* with loss of preconsonantal *r* (no doubt quite early, because of the dental consonant which follows—see A A Hill, "Early Loss of [r] before Dentals," *PMLA*, LV [1940], 308-359) cf. *cuss*, *bust*, *fust* ("first"), *nuss* ("nurse"). The labial consonant of course accounts for the N. E. absence of unrounding of early [ʊ]—an unrounding which on the contrary is usually to be heard in *pussy* ("fat"),

age the word still calls forth its earlier connotations, as is evidenced by the sniggers and the howls of ribald laughter which issue from the loudspeaker whenever the word is used, as it all too frequently is, by *soi-disant* comedians on the radio. Nevertheless, this word with its anatomically altered meaning may be said to have passed into ordinary slang, particularly in the phrase "a sock in the puss," which, though somewhat crude, is felt to be in no way indecent. *Cony*⁶ ("rabbit") by a similar metonymic process, perhaps supported by the suggestion of *cunnus* and its English equivalent (*Quære* Was the author and illustrator of a book called *Country Matters*, published in 1937, aware of the outrageous paronomastic implications of the phrase as it is used in *Hamlet*, III, II, 123?), came to acquire, by 1591 at the latest, the same indecent signification as did *puss(y)* somewhat later. Readers of Elizabethan drama will be perfectly familiar with the frequent playing upon the double meaning of this word (similar to the many jokes involving the double meaning of *firk* in Early Modern English), which survives

from *pursy*, which is quite another word. Long-established sexuo-zoological analogy (Eng *cony*, *malkin*, *merkin*, Fr *chat*, *angora*, *lapin*, Lat *porcus*, Gk *χοίρος*, with its diminutives *χοιρίδιον* and *χοιρίδιον* [In the Latin and Greek terms is there a suggestion of Oriental depilation?]), would have provided semantic support for the phonological development. For *purse* with yonic significance see Donne's "Love's Progress" (*The Poems of John Donne*, ed H J C Grierson [Oxford, 1912], I, 119, line 92), Beaumont and Fletcher's *Little French Lawyer* "And put a good speed penny in my purse,/ That has been empty these twenty years" (*Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed A R Waller [Cambridge, 1906], III, 451), the broadside song "The Turnep Ground" (ca 1720), printed in J S Farmer's *Merry Songs and Ballads* (London, 1897), I, 224 "When gently down I Layd her, She Op't a Purse as black as Coal, To hold my Coin", "A Pleasant New Ballad" ("Being a pleasant discourse between a country lass and a young tailor"), reprinted as from the *Rowburghe Ballads* in *Poetica Erotica*, ed T R Smith (New York, 1927), pp 305-307, which uses similar metonymy in "fringed bag," as does Dufey in his use of *sack* in the same sense. See also Farmer and Henley's *Slang and Its Analogues, Past and Present* (London, 1890-1904), s v "monosyllable". The *NED* fails to give this meaning of *purse*, but lists equally appropriate uses of the word with the meaning "scrotum".

⁶ The historical pronunciation is indicated by the spelling *cunny*. According to the *NED*, "It is possible that the desire to avoid certain vulgar associations with the word in the *cunny* form, may have contributed to the preference for a different pronunciation in reading the Scriptures. Walker knew only the *cunny* pronunciation, Smart (1836) says 'it is familiarly pronounced cunny,' but *cōny* is 'proper for solemn reading'."

with its historical pronunciation in the schoolboy expression *cunny-thumbed* ("having the fist closed with the thumb turned inward under the fingers"), used in the game of marbles⁷

The word *ballock* (O E *bealluc* "testicle"), with its variant *bollock*, is archaic, in metropolitan usage at least, save in the phrase *ballocks up*, variously spelled, in which it is employed frequently, not to say usually, with no sense of its original significance and hence with no idea of impropriety⁸. Much more common is *ball up*, with identical present meaning ("disarrange, put out of order, confuse, disconcert, thwart," etc.), which the *NED* (Supplement) labels "U S" and defines as "clog" or "become clogged," presumably with balls (of snow, clay, etc.), with the statement that the expression is also used figuratively. This may be so, but it seems to me highly likely that *ball up* and *ballocks (bollocks) up* are merely formal variants. The British *balls-up*, labeled "low" by Partridge, (*op. cit.*, s. v.), is unquestionably the same⁹. Otherwise, the similarity in form and the identity in meaning taken to-

⁷ Not in the *DAE*, though the term was perfectly familiar to me as a boy. The *English Dialect Dictionary* records both *cunny fingered* and *cunny thumbed*.

⁸ Barnacle Bill the Sailor, a sort of nautical Paul Bunyan, was Ballocky Bill in the original ballad commemorating his adventures, usually amorous and on a scale in keeping with his original name. The popular song heard a few years back was presumably a bowdlerized version of this ballad, with toning down of subject matter similar to the toning down of the hero's name, which would have been a bit too bald to fool anybody. No such feeling, however, attaches to *ballocks up*. A young woman of unimpeachable modesty shocked her elderly uncle when, employing the phrase as learned from his own lips, she remarked to him that circumstances had occurred to "ballocks up" certain of her plans. In Arthur Kober's "Dilemma in the Bronx" (*New Yorker*, 7 Sept 1946), Mac (*né* Max), who is of the essence of refinement and much given to euphemism—witness his delicacy in referring to his "kidney condition"—writes to Billie (*née* Bella) Gross of his regret that World War II had come along to "boilix" everything up (p. 32). Conscious that the word is not quite standard English, he primly puts it within quotation marks. The word, with the spelling *bohw*, is to be found in the presumably chaste pages of a periodical known as *The Family Circle* (5 April 1946), according to an inquiry as to its meaning in "Miscellany," *American Speech*, xxii (1947), 158, where it is "surmised to be of recent origin."

⁹ The use of the plural form of the noun is unquestionably responsible for the lowly transatlantic status of the phrase. *Ball*, like *breast*, is likely to become indelicate with pluralization.

gether must be accounted a truly remarkable coincidence. In any case, there can be no doubt of the original indelicacy of *ballocks up*, which, with the obsolescence of *ballock*, has passed into fairly general familiar use¹⁰

A similar contempt for the appurtenances of sex—a contempt more apparent than real, and manifesting itself largely in linguistic behavior—is indicated by the now uninhibited use of *nuts* as an exclamation of disgust or disparagement and in the phrase “Nuts to you (it).” As Mr Mencken points out, when the word in this application came into general use, “its etymology must have been apparent to everyone old enough to vote, yet it seems to have met with no opposition from guardians of the national morals”¹¹ For a while the word was euphemized to *nerts*, which fooled nobody, but this flimsily disguised form is now quite old-fashioned. *Balls*, used in exactly the same way, has not fared so well socially it is distinctly “low” on either side of the Atlantic. Whereas the American co-ed, or even her maiden aunt, may unblushingly hiss, “Nuts to you!”¹² taboo continues to operate against its British equivalent, “Balls to you!” Incidentally, it is just possible that the familiar *boloney* (*baloney*, *balony*), popularized by the late Alfied E Smith, is also an example of unconscious obscenity, if, as Partridge (*op cit*, s v “boloney”) believes, the word had originally nothing to do with Bologna sausages, but is derived from Gipsy *peloné* (“testicles”). Be that as it may, “that’s all boloney” is exactly

¹⁰ The word *ballock* is not listed in any of its forms in Berrey and Van den Bark’s *American Thesaurus of Slang* (New York, 1945), Harold Wentworth’s *American Dialect Dictionary* (New York, 1944), or Farmer and Henley’s *Slang and Its Analogues*. All “commercial” dictionaries save Webster’s *New International* omit it, perhaps because it is felt to be obsolete, perhaps *pudoris causa*. Wright’s *English Dialect Dictionary* lists the compounds *balack-handed*, *bollocky-handed* (“left-handed,” hence “clumsy”) and the derivative *bollocky* (*bollocky*) (“left-handed”) *Ballocks up* is recorded in none of the dictionaries consulted

¹¹ *The American Language* (4th ed, New York, 1936), p. 300

¹² Despite its widespread distribution and apparent respectability, the word may not be heard in the cinema. In 1941, Will Hays, then head of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc., included it among a list of words to be omitted from all pictures. It may, however, be used in the sense of “crazy.” Presumably Mr Hays’s successor has not rescinded this order, for, in a long career of movie-going, I do not recollect a single occasion when my ears were sullied with the word in the sense under discussion

the equivalent in meaning of British "that's all balls" (printable in England since 1931, but held to be obscene in 1929)

The familiar expressions "not to give a fig for something (somebody)," "not worth a fig," and "a fig for it!"¹¹—all freely used in polite society and in polite literature as well—had originally, it is to be suspected, an obscene signification, *fig* being in the beginning used not merely as a symbol of valuelessness, but as a symbol of obscenity, as in similar expressions never heard in mixed company and implying the same indifference to or contempt for something or somebody held to be of no worth—again the denigration of sex, which may be considered almost a minor linguistic phenomenon. According to the *NED*, *fig* is used as "a type of anything small, valueless, or contemptible" from *ca* 1400. Although the word does not occur in English with manifestly sexual connotation until 1579, according to the same authority (1 *e* as the equivalent of its use in French *faire la figue*, meaning to make the indecently insulting gesture of thrusting the thumb between two of the closed fingers, with biting the thumb, as in the opening scene of *Romeo and Juliet*, a less obviously indelicate variation),¹² I think that it is not straining the imagination too much to suspect that the sexual significance of the word, as well as the accompanying gesture, were known in England long before that date. In all the earlier uses of *fig* cited by the *NED*, in which the word is presumably used as "a type of anything small, valueless, or contemptible," the alternative indecent meaning might well be present

¹¹ Cf Pistol's "A footre [1 *e* *foutre*] for the world and worldlings base!" and "A footre for thine office!" (2 *Henry IV*, v, iii, 103 and 121). The *NED* chastely refrains from defining the word, listed under *foutre*, *fouter*, from O F. *foutre* (Lat *futuere*), also the source of Sir Richard Burton's verb *futter*. Except in Burton's coinage, the infinitive is used substantively in English, both as a symbol of worthlessness, as in Shakespeare's use, and as a contemptuous appellation, as in Marryat's doubtless innocent use, cited *supra*, note 1.

It is just possible that the exclamatory (Oh) *foot!* ("pshaw!") is a survival of some such phrase as "a *foutre* for it!" The *NED* labels obsolete this use of *foot* as an oath or exclamation, which it derives from "Christ's foot!" by way of "'s foot!" but I have frequently heard it as a sort of girl's boarding-school profanity, though not very recently. In any case, it was by no means obsolete fifteen or twenty years ago.

¹² Cf Italian *fico* and Spanish *figo*, used also in Early Modern English, both occurring in Shakespeare along with English *fig* in this meaning (*Henry V*, iii, vi, 60, *ibid.*, iii, vi, 62, *ibid.*, iv, i, 60, 2 *Henry IV*, v, iii, 121, *Merry Wives*, i, iii, 31).

The vowel of the first syllable of *shutepoke* has perhaps tended to becloud its scatological origin. At any rate, it is certain that the ladies of our grandmothers' generation had no idea of the significance of the word when they used it jocularly and endearingly to their children and grandchildren as the equivalent of "little rascal" *Bugger* ([bʌgər] and, more frequently in American English [bʊgər]), one of the most unprintable words in British English,¹⁴ was, and doubtless still is, used by unsuspecting souls who would be appalled if they knew its origin and its present meaning in standard British English (though dialectally it is, as in American English, simply the equivalent of "chap," "fellow" cf. French *bougre*, with precisely the same status).

Fest (also *fice*, *fist* [faɪst], *phyce*, *fise*, *fiste*, *faust*) has long been a perfectly proper designation for a small, worthless cur in American English, whence the adjective *feisty*, sometimes applied to a restless, troublesome, fussy child.¹⁵ The noun, originally meaning "*flatus ventris*" (as opposed to "*crepitus ventris*"), actually denoted a frequent failing of dogs not usually referred to *coram publico*. But its original meaning has become quite obsolete, as also in the related *fizz*, *fizzle*, and *foist*. A similar gastric metaphor is evident in *peter out* (Fr. *péter*), the equivalent of *fizzle out*. It is to be wondered how many who quote Hamlet's "Hoist with his own petar(d)" are aware of the coarse joke in the etymology of *petard*, or, for that matter, whether Shakespeare was himself aware of it. *Pétard* as a military or pyrotechnical term would seem to have no indecent connotations in Modern French. *Pétarade* with its literal meaning is of course low in that language, but, for all I can discover, apparently perfectly proper as a military term for "useless cannonade", similarly, *pet-de-nonne* ("apple fritter") and *pet-en-l'air*.¹⁶ ("short morning gown"), yet French verbal delicacy prefers *impasse* to *cul-de-sac*, *vespasienne* to *pissoir*.

But there is really no need of multiplying examples. Enough has

¹⁴ Actionable in British English until 1934, according to Partridge, *op cit*, s. v.

¹⁵ For other applications, see Phyllis J. Nixon, *A Glossary of Virginia Words*, Publication of the American Dialect Society, Number 5 (May 1946), p. 21.

¹⁶ For an amusingly fanciful etymology of this expression, see the chapter "The Pet en l'Air" in the continuation of Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* by John Hall Stephenson ("Eugenius") (New-York, 1795, pp. 281-282).

been written to demonstrate a minor aspect of linguistic behavior which has not, so far as I know, been pointed out before—the unwitting indecency of respectability. It will be noted that euphemism is not involved, as it is in such expressions as “horsefeathers,” “bull” (or “b. s.”),¹⁷ “s o b,” “S O L” (explained as “short of luck”), or the many *-fu* words of army slang,¹⁸ the full, unmutilated form is uncompromisingly and unhesitatingly employed, frequently by a class of speakers who are, when they are actually conscious of verbal indelicacy, highly intolerant of it, people who are indignant at any literature which employs words connected with sex or excretion with which they happen to be familiar. They are, as has been said, good, sweet people for the most part, who are sometimes more offended at verbal indecency when they recognize it as such than at downright immoral conduct, like the old gentleman who objected to Joyce’s *Ulysses*, not because of what the people in the story did, but because of certain words they used. There is, as we have seen, a largish class of verbal indelicacies, including some of those discussed in this paper, which have undergone a toning-down or a complete loss of their original content, these are freely and undisguisedly used in all innocence by speakers who are, when aware of the slightest hint of verbal impropriety, careful to avoid it at all costs. The cream of the jest is, that those who would wear fig-leaves on their lips should be unintentionally guilty of even a limited use of words and phrases as shocking a few generations ago as would be much of the fireside and dinner-table talk at the great houses of Elizabethan England or, for that matter, of Colonial Virginia, were we privileged miraculously to hear it.

THOMAS PYLES

University of Florida

¹⁷ See H. L. Mencken, *The American Language Supplement One* (New York, 1945), p. 657.

¹⁸ *Snafu* was explained to “Mom” as “situation normal—all fouled up,” but G. I. Joe knew perfectly well what the italicized word really stood for. Euphemism is here involved, in both the word itself and the bowdlerized phrase. See J. A. Fleece, “Words in *-Fu*,” *American Speech*, XXI (1946), 70-72.

MANLY'S MARGINAL NOTES ON THE 'PIERS PLOWMAN' CONTROVERSY

In 1910, after four years of study and dispute, John M. Manly ceased to champion his hypothesis of the multiple authorship of *Piers Plowman*, at least in print. Apparently R. W. Chambers' first articles¹ convinced him that none of the arguments he planned to elaborate² could be pressed home until a satisfactory critical text became available. And no such text appeared during his lifetime.³ The controversy has been prolonged for decades, however, by protagonists of the 'multiple authorship' hypothesis who did not realize as keenly as Manly the impossibility of countering the arguments by Chambers and his followers, who had access to the files on which the critical text is being based.

But there is reason to believe that, in spite of Manly's decision to withdraw from the controversy, his beliefs remained unshaken and his interest never abated even under the immense burden of the *Canterbury Tales* project. One striking source of evidence is the marginalia in his personal copy of Bright's *New Light on 'Piers Plowman,'* 1928, especially in Chambers' preface to that work.⁴ The marginal notes, in his distinctive vertical handwriting, do not seem extensive, except in contrast with the sparseness of his marginal comments on other books he possessed,⁵ but they are certainly positive enough to reflect his attitude.

It may have seemed to Manly that, as he waited for the critical text, the traditional view of the authorship of *Piers Plowman* was regaining its dominance, almost by default.⁶ If so, we may credit

¹ R. W. Chambers and J. H. G. Grattan, "The Text of *Piers Plowman* The A-Text," *MLR*, iv (1909), 357 ff., R. W. Chambers, "The Authorship of *Piers Plowman*," *MLR*, v (1910), 1 ff.

² J. M. Manly, "The Lost Leaf of *Piers the Plowman*," *MP*, iii (1906), 360.

³ In fact, it has been indefinitely postponed. Cf. G. R. Coffman, "The Present State of a Critical Edition of *Piers Plowman*," *Speculum*, xx (1945), 482-83.

⁴ A. H. Bright, *New Light on 'Piers Plowman'* (London, 1928).

⁵ An examination of hundreds of his books (now in the University of Chicago Library) underlies this assertion.

⁶ Judging by the scholarship of the past decade, I feel his fears have been

him with pardonable asperity in his comments whenever Chambers rhetorically puts words in the mouths of his opponents to the implication in Chambers' "no one has yet denied the unity of authorship of all this section (A1)," he responds, "No one wishes to deny this"⁷ At another point Chambers writes "But the supporters of multiple authorship may reply there were several authois, one born eight miles west from Malvern Hills (at Ledbury, if Mr Bright will have it so), another born at Cleobury", Manly underlines *may* and adds, "They do not"⁸ Elsewhere Manly challenges Chambers to cite a point where the proponents of multiple authorship argue from the double identification of the author (William Langland vs the son of Stacy de Rokayle) that there are two authors, or argue that it is improbable for a son of Stacy to take a name not connected with the family⁹ Chambers' "it is not always realized that this version of the poem (A-text) is incomplete" calls forth the comment, "Always realized by us."¹⁰

One of the arguments Chambers advanced reminded Manly of a basic desideratum of his Chaucer investigation early versions of the various poems¹¹ When Chambers argues "if A2 were an addition made at another time by another person, copies of A1 would have got around without a sequel," for "its circulation in an earlier form could not be stopped," Manly answers "We have no copies of the earlier versions of Chaucer's tales"¹² Although some of the Canterbury tales were in circulation before Chaucer conceived the work itself, Manly's *a fortiori* argument seems weak unless he also felt that a principle of manuscript preservation was involved—specifically, that complete works tend to force fragmentary units out of circulation¹³ (Considerably less relevant is the

justified, e g, the change in attitude expressed by T P Dunning, "Langland and the Salvation of the Heathen," *Med Aev*, xii (1943), 45 fn But Manly probably wrote these particular comments at a time when many scholars were impressed with the arguments for multiple authorship advanced by Mabel Day, "The Revisions of *Piers Plowman*," *MLR*, xxiii (1928), 1 ff

⁷ Bright, p 12

⁹ *Ibid.*, p 25

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p 14

¹¹ J M Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), ii, 495-514

¹² Bright, p 16

¹³ In *MLR*, vi, 306-9, R W Chambers took cognizance of this difficulty as he stated his position in greater detail

comment on Chambers' continuation of the same argument that copies of A1 would have survived, the accompanying note is. "But A2 is professedly a continuation, meaningless without A1")¹⁴

Twice Manly questions statements that the three versions are alike in their sources, particularly in having an "extraordinary fondness" for the psalter¹⁵ But his primary concern throughout the article is with the arguments bearing on the relative characteristics of the three versions Not only does he deny that "the search for *Do-wel*, *Do-bet*, and *Do-best* follows a closely ordered scheme,"¹⁶ but when Chambers says that compared to A, "B is equally clear," Manly retorts "He is not, and no one thought he was until it became necessary in controversy"¹⁷ To the assertion, again bolstered by the belief in single authorship, that "this B-continuation is emphatically an example of 'organized and consecutive thinking,'" Manly repeats what he had said frequently in his earlier articles "It cannot be stated in detail"¹⁸ Elsewhere he expresses the converse of that premise, when Bright says that *Piers Plowman* in general "is not a clear-cut, coherent document," Manly notes "But A1 is clear-cut and coherent"¹⁹

Finally, he hit upon an admission, appearing for the first time in Chambers,²⁰ which he might have used as an opening wedge had he returned to the controversy "And no evidence for multiple authorship that will enduce scrutiny has yet been produced, although C is probably much interpolated"²¹ If these interpolations are at a point where textual recension cannot eliminate them, at least a reviser (author) for C must be accepted But in general, the indications are that any new publication by Manly would have followed the same lines of argument as before, with the addition of whatever

¹⁴ Bright, p 16 Manly must have misread the copy

¹⁵ *Ibid*, p 23 For contradictory evidence, cf Chambers, *MLR*, xiv, 135-38 and W W Skeat, *EETS*, xviii, xiv

¹⁶ Bright, p 14

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p 19 Explicit statements about the relative clarity cannot be found, but Manly's point is implied, e g, W C Hazlitt, ed, *Warton's History of English Poetry*, II, 245

¹⁸ Bright, p 19

¹⁹ Bright, p 29

²⁰ In *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (London, 1939), p 167, Chambers repeats this admission

²¹ Bright, p 23

the new text would have permitted him to salvage from his elaborate compilations of data on the vocabulary, style and dialects of the three versions

THEODORE A. STROUD

Drake University

THE MAN OF LAW'S TALE

Mr Bernard I. Duffey has written at some length on Chaucer's art and intention in writing MLT.¹ The older critics, he says, laid emphasis on "its sincerity of expression and genuine emotional appeal," later critics on its conventionality and even artificiality, and he himself on Chaucer's "efforts mainly toward producing a sentimental tale" of somewhat popular interest and suited to the bourgeois taste of the Man of Law. Some of this may bear looking into.

MLT has provoked divergent critical opinions. Mr Duffey does not canvas all their variety, nor does he include Miss Schlauch's view (in *Sources and Analogues*, 1941) that the result of Chaucer's additions to his source was "to infuse into the quaint, traditional plot the pathos of sentiment and suffering human beings, to elevate what was dead and conventional into the realm of art." Which places Miss Schlauch among the older critics. The theory of Skeat and others that MLT was written before the 'Canterbury period' and afterwards revised has now been generally rejected by the scholars in favor of a date c 1390. This latter view is based on arguments, reasonable but not altogether convincing, from the relation of MLT to Gower and the *De Contemptu Mundi*. But the real 'critical problem' of the poem is why at any date (unless *very* early) Chaucer should have occupied himself with such a crude implausible tale. The solution must of course remain speculative.

There is no necessary reason for supposing that whatever its date MLT was written for the Canterbury Tales, but if it was it could have been made suitable for the Prioress or the Parson, or even the Plowman or the Second Nun. Nothing helpful can be gleaned from the present Introduction to the tale (which is a mare's nest of confusing and conflicting details), nor from the Epilogue, in which the

¹ "The Intention and Art of 'The Man of Law's Tale,'" *ELH*, xiv (1947), 181 ff.

Parson is called upon to follow. If then one regards MLT by itself, just what sort of piece is it? Clearly it is an edifying story of a Christian woman's suffering, patience, and triumph. It is of course not hagiographic in the strict sense, but it has hagiographic elements if not borrowings. In what spirit did Chaucer attack such 'material'? I should like to suggest a tentative answer that Chaucer approached it in a spirit midway between what you might call low seriousness and levity. His generally ironic attitude would recognize the absurdities of the tale, his naturally mediæval attitude would not wholly condemn it, since no author is wholly detached from the spirit of his age. To rework such crude popular material and see what could be done with it might well seem amusing.

The evidences of this view are of three sorts. 1 the addition of scriptural and astrological matter to help account for the improbabilities of the plot, 2 the rhetorical outbursts, which are not unlike those of the NPT, and 3 the human and humorous touches, some of them really moving and some of them slightly cynical.

The first stand out and have always been recognized: the stars, 190 ff., the "O Mars," 294 ff., the "O Satan," 365 ff., Satan again, 582 ff., Daniel and Jonah, 470 ff., David and Judith, 932 ff. But some of these, namely the "O Mars," "O Satan," and the David and Judith are delivered with rhetorical gusto and belong also with the second sort of evidence. To them should be added the brief "God hym see!" (156) and "Now, faire Custance, almyghty God thee gyde!" (245), and emphasis on the "roialtee At mariage" (701 ff.), and particularly the more explosive rhetoric of "O sowdanesse, . . . thou Semyrame" (358 ff.), "Allas, Custance, thou hast no champioun" (631 ff.), the "O messenger" and "O Donegild" stanzas (771 ff.), and "O foule lust" (925 ff.). All these together produce a very striking effect. In an obviously humorous setting like NPT they would be recognized for what they are, in their own setting they require only a little imagination to give them their proper value.

The third sort of evidence is more difficult to appreciate and to explicate. Some of the small human and humorous touches are, like the scriptural and astrological passages, designed to relieve the story of part of its unconvincingness. (This is truer for us, of course, than for many of Chaucer's first readers, for whom a story was good if the moral was good. But Chaucer was both a mediæval and an

artist) For example, Custance's prayer (449 ff), which is quite genuine, the "pale face" stanza, which every reader feels to be one of the finest in the poem, and the long added passage (835 ff) of piety and tender pathos, with its pretty realism of the squalling infant (866) Perhaps with these should be put the two or three historical allusions But beside them, inconspicuous yet not to be overlooked, are the openly cynical points The semi-climactic "And thus hath Crist ymaad Custance a queene" (693) might be put down as merely a lapse of taste—from the modern point of view But the parenthesis describing Satan as still overthrown and "boond" by Our Lord (634) is either extremely naive or outright sarcastic, particularly in view of the Satanic influence over Custance's life explicitly declared in 365 ff, 582 ff It will hardly do to call it conventional in this context Then there are the notes of specific levity, so characteristic of Chaucer—

I may nat telle hir wo until to morwe,
I am so very for to speke of sorwe (1070 f)

and the omission of "Maurices lyf" because "I bere it noght in mynde" (1127) There is the reticence of Custance about her past (524 ff, 972 f) (however it may be explained as vestigial to the lost incest motif), in one instance not above suspicion of falsehood The delay of more than nine years by Custance's father before he decided to avenge his daughter, and the delay of more than five years before Alla repents the killing of his mother, are passed over in pregnant silence, and similarly the accumulation of coincidences at the end is left to speak for itself But nothing could equal the bad taste on Chaucer's part of the gratuitous reference to connubiality of even the holiest of women (a whole stanza of it, 708 ff) if he meant the poem to be read with high seriousness.

Now these last are points which nobody will accept readily Though Chaucer has a name for being humorous, and it is dangerous to overlook the humorous potentialities everywhere in his work, readers never like to have humor revealed to them, and when one does reveal it they are inclined to resent the implication and reject the humor But all I ask is that some concession be made in this piece to the possibility that Chaucer appeased his own sense of the ridiculous in his story while at the same time he made the most of its piety and pathos Such ambivalence is of the Chaucerian essence.

PAUL F BAUM

DR JOHNSON ON DR HILL

In his strictures upon his contemporaries, Dr Johnson was no less impressive when he was wrong than when he was right. Further, he was equally quotable. A good instance of Johnson in pontifical error appears in his characterization of Dr John Hill, a gentleman whose deserved reputation was sufficiently bad in fact to need none of the gilding of defamatory fiction.

Hill is probably best remembered now as the subject of Garrick's epigram

For Farces and Physic his equal there scarce is,
His Farces are Physic, his Physic a Farce is.¹

Or perhaps as the "Pimp! Poet! Puffer! 'Pothecary! Play'r!" of Smart's *Hillrad*, which is a full-length traduction of the doctor. This is unfortunate because, though Hill was a vain, mercenary, sometimes dishonest social-climber, though he did on occasion write trash, though he was not averse to profiting by quackery, it is quite misleading to sum him up as "an apothecary, hackwriter, and scurrilous pamphleteer who closed his life by becoming a quack doctor."² For he was also a scientist, who introduced the Linnaean system of classification to England,³ who wrote works such as the *British Herbal*,⁴ *General Natural History*,⁵ *The Construction of*

¹ Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed G B Hill, Oxford, 1887, II, 38

² *Chamber's Cyclopaedia of English Literature*, London, 1927, II, 424

³ In 1751. See T G Hill, *Makers of British Botany*, ed F W Oliver, Cambridge, 1913, p 101. Because his work was more exact (and perhaps because he was a Fellow of the Royal Society—which Hill had bitterly attacked), William Hudson sometimes is given credit for "the establishment of Linnaean principles of botany in England." But Hill, whose attitude toward the Linnaean system was both critical and laudatory, anticipated Hudson by eleven years. Peter Collins wrote to Linnaeus "Dr Hill is publishing a history of plants, of which I send you a specimen. As he proceeds through the genres, he criticizes your method, but not like the foul-mouthed Germans. He treats you like an Englishman, with decency and good manners, and although we cannot agree in all points, for no system can be perfect, yet we honor and esteem you." (*A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus*, ed James E Smith, London, 1821, I, 389)

⁴ "A work of considerable originality . . . our earliest post-Linnaean authority for *Valerianella*, *Linaria*, *Nymphoides*, etc." (Ellison Hawks and G S Boulger, *Pioneers of Plant Study*, New York, 1928, p 256)

⁵ This is a three volume work published between 1748-52, which Von Haller recognized "as a work of infinite labor and great utility" (see

Timber,⁶ *The Sleep of Plants*,⁷ and *The Vegetable System*,⁸ which are not to be fobbed off as hackwriting, and who was one of the foremost microscopists of his time. This is a side of the man scarcely touched upon by such writers as Cross, Jensen, Baker, Hill, and others, who have noticed him only as his activities infringed upon those of Fielding, Garrick, Smart, and Johnson, and who seem, in general, to have come to evaluations of him suspiciously similar to those their heroes held. The instance of character-distortion at hand may not seem a major one, though it is certainly not to be called minor, but it will serve very well to suggest the possibility that Hill has suffered other similar misrepresentations at the hands of biographers of his contemporaries.

Curiously, Dr. Johnson's criticism dealt specifically with Hill as microscopist. It was delivered during his famous private meeting with the King, at Buckingham House, in 1767. In the course of the conversation the King "asked him what he thought of Hill."

Johnson answered, that he was an ingenious man, but had no veracity, and immediately mentioned, as an instance of it, an assertion of that writer, that he had seen objects magnified to a much greater degree by using three or four microscopes at a time, than by using one. "Now, (added Johnson,) everyone acquainted with microscopes knows, that the more of them he looks through, the less the object will appear." "Why, (replied the King,) this is not only telling an untruth, but telling it clumsily, for, if that be the case, everyone who can look through a microscope will be able to detect him."

"I now, (said Johnson to his friends when relating what had passed) began to consider that I was depreciating this man in the estimation of his Sovereign, and thought it was time for me to say something that might be

L. L. Woodruff, "The Versatile Sir John Hill, M.D.," *The American Naturalist*, LX, September, 1926, 428. It was the second volume of this work which introduced the Linnaean system of classification to England, the third volume, says Woodruff, "is noteworthy because it is the first work of the kind to include accounts of the several classes of Animalcules, visible only by the assistance of microscopes" (*loc cit*).

"Contains good investigations respecting the structure of wood, as also respecting the effects of the absorption of coloured fluids,—and it is adorned with good plates" (A. P. Decandolle and K. Sprengel, *Elements of the Philosophy of Plants*, trans. from German, Edinburgh, 1821, p. 321).

⁷ See T. J. Hill, *op cit*, pp. 96-100.

⁸ A work of twenty-six volumes, including sixteen hundred plates, undertaken by Hill under the patronage of Lord Bute and produced between 1759-1775. For this work, the King of Sweden made Hill, as he had earlier done Linnaeus, Knight of the Polar Star.

more favourable' He added, therefore, that Dr Hill was, notwithstanding, a very curious observer, and if he would have been contented to tell the world no more than he knew, he might have been a very considerable man, and needed not to have recourse to such mean expedients to raise his reputation⁹

How much the King and Johnson knew about microscopy is open to question, though it is to be assumed that each of them had toyed with the microscope. Only a year before, George Adams had published his celebrated work on Globes for which Johnson wrote the dedication to the King, "and for so doing received a present of very curious meteorological instruments of a new and ingenious construction"¹⁰ And in 1761 Adams had made a silver microscope, very elaborately ornamented, which his Majesty may have enjoyed playing with

But it is improbable that either of them was as skilled with the instrument as Hill, of whom it has been said that he "was an expert with the microscope, probably second to none in England at the time"¹¹ He used it constantly, wrote much about his discoveries, and even made some efforts toward improvement George Adams (son of the Adams previously mentioned) included in the bibliography of his *Essays on the Microscope*, six of Hill's works and said "Dr. Hill and Mr Custand now endeavoured to bring back the microscope nearer to the old standard, to increase the field *by the multiplication of the eye glasses*, and to augment the light on the object, by condensing lenses, and in this they happily succeeded"¹²

In other words, Johnson, if he knew anything of microscopy at all, was the veriest amateur whereas Hill was a professional of good repute Yet Johnson had the temerity to condemn the man before his sovereign in the very field in which he did not merit condemnation Worse than this, what Hill had been referring to was lenses combined in the compound microscope of recent development which *did* magnify objects to a greater degree than the earlier microscope

⁹ G B Hill, *op cit*, II, 389

¹⁰ Reginald S Clay and Thomas H Court, *The History of the Microscope*, London, 1932, p 163

¹¹ L L Woodruff, *op cit*, p 429. See also J R Green, *A History of Botany*, London, 1914, p 222, John Quekett, *A Practical Treatise on the Use of the Microscope*, London, 1855, p 29

¹² George Adams, *Essays on the Microscope*, 2nd ed, London, 1798, p 20 (The italics are mine)

had done¹³ There is wonderful irony in Johnson's remark that if Hill "would have been contented to tell the world no more than he knew, he might have been a very considerable man," for so, in this instance, Hill had done and was pontifically called a liar for it by one who was himself telling the world a good deal more than he knew.

This incident puts Dr Johnson in a rather bad light Boswell's editor, G B Hill, comes off no better In the notes he quotes Garrick's epigram, some satirical lines from Churchill's *Rosciad*, a slur by Hawkins upon Hill's pretensions, as M D, a snobbish remark from one of Walpole's letters, a squib from the *Gentleman's Magazine* concerning Hill's failure as an actor, and a passage from D'Israeli exposing Hill's mercenary, unscholarly methods of work¹⁴ That Hill had any possible virtues at all is carefully concealed And of Dr. Johnson's egregious error he says only "Mr Croker quotes Bishop Erlington, who says, 'Dr Johnson was unjust to Hill, and showed that *he* did not understand the subject' Croker's *Boswell*, p 186"¹⁵ Whether he was covering up for Johnson is a matter of question, but it is interesting to observe that in Croker's edition the note to this passage was rather more specific and illuminating

Here, Bishop Erlington observed, Dr Johnson was unjust to Hill, and showed that *he* did not understand the subject Hill does *not* talk of magnifying objects by *two* or *more* microscopes, but by applying two *object glasses* to *one microscope*, and the advantage of diminished spherical errors by this contrivance is well known Hill's account of the experiment is obscurely and inaccurately expressed in one or two particulars, but there can be no doubt that he is substantially right, and that Dr Johnson's statement was altogether unfounded¹⁶

Concerning Hill, Croker had contented himself with quoting Garrick's ubiquitous epigram, and calling him a literary and medical quack who had assumed the title of Sir John "on receiving a Swedish order of Knighthood."¹⁷

CLARK EMERY

University of Miami

¹³ See T. J. Hill, *op cit*, p. 105.

¹⁴ *Op cit*, II, 389

¹⁵ *Loc cit*

¹⁶ Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed John Wilson Croker, London, 1860, p 186

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p 185. Napier's edition of Boswell indexes Hill as "Dr John, a quack doctor on whom Garrick made a famous Epigram"

STEELE AND THE DRURY LANE PATENT

Among the many eighteenth century documents preserved at Blenheim Castle there is what G A Aitken in his *The Life of Richard Steele* takes to be a list of the petty expenses incurred by Steele in the routine procedure of obtaining the license for Drury Lane Theater which was granted on October 18, 1714¹ According to Aitken this list is dated October 28, 1714, just ten days after the license had passed² Here is the list as he quotes it

Minutes of Accounts

To Mr Saunderson for Drawing the Comedians case	1 10-06
To the Solicitor Generall upon delivering Him the case of the comedians	2 03 00
To the Solicitor for his opinions thereupon	2 03 00
To the Solicitor upon giving Him the Reference at Mr Steele's Petition	2 03 00
To the Attorney on the same	2 04 06
To Solicitor for signing the report	2 03 00
To the Attorney's clerk	1 01 06
To Servants at y ^e office	1 10 00
For the Reference at Sec office	2 02-06

Mr Tully—Mr Chantrell—Mr Jones

Hoadley—Clarke

Philips to be at y^e Aquat—(?) 28th Oct^r 1714

Chr Rich/ since dead³

What Steele intended by the names at the end of the memorandum it is now impossible to say Tully was Steele's attorney in 1712, Hoadley and Clarke must have been Steele's friends Bishop Hoadley and Dr Samuel Clarke, Philips was perhaps Ambrose Philips, Christopher Rich was obviously the ill-natured patentee who died on November 4, 1714, exactly one week *after* the presumptive date of

¹ G A Aitken, *The Life of Richard Steele*, Cambridge, Mass, 1889, II, 49

² *Idem*

³ *Ibid*, II, 49, 50

the memorandum ⁴ There is apparently a discrepancy in dates, but the explanation may be the simple one that the phrase "since dead" was added a week or more after the memorandum was written

Another explanation, however, suggests itself It seems possible that the expenses referred to were incurred not in obtaining the license of October 18, 1714, but in obtaining the patent of January 19, 1714/15, which replaced the license The manner in which the date is included makes it possible at least that it was not intended as the date of the memorandum itself. But what principally gives this conjecture plausibility is the list of the expenses themselves, expenses which seem more consistent with what we know of Steele's receiving the patent than of his receiving the license

The statements we have about Steele's receiving the license—that of Cibber in his *Apology* ⁵ and that of Steele himself in a memorandum preserved also at Blenheim ⁶—emphasize the ease with which it was obtained it was granted almost as soon as the request was made We hear nothing of legal complications or of the need for the opinions of the Solicitor General and the Attorney. There was no question of the legality of the new license, there was no question but that the King had the power to issue a new license if he desired. In the Lord Chamberlain's papers at the Public Records Office no reference has been found to an opinion of either the Solicitor General or the Attorney regarding Steele's license On the contrary there is preserved in the Public Records Office a copy of Steele's petition to the King for the Patent, dated January 10, 1714(15), with an endorsement appended to it The endorsement refers explicitly to the Solicitor General and to the Attorney "His Majesty is graciously pleased to refer this Petition to Mr Attorney or Mr Solicitor General to consider thereof and report his Opinion what his Majesty may fitly do therein whereupon his Majesty will declare his further Pleasure. (signed) Townshend" ⁷ On January twelfth the Attorney and the Solicitor General rendered their

⁴ Percy Fitzgerald, *A New History of the English Stage*, London, 1882, I, 388

⁵ Colley Cibber, *An Apology for the Life of Mr Colley Cibber*, edited by R. W. Lowe, London, 1889, II, 164, 165

⁶ Quoted in Aitken, *op cit*, II, 48 Steele says "Message from the King to know whether I was in earnest in desiring the Playhouse or that others thought of it for me—If I like it I should have it as an earnest of His future favour"

⁷ Public Records Office, L. C. 7/3

opinion that the King could lawfully grant the patent, and again we have a complete record preserved among the Lord Chamberlain's papers ⁸

It would seem, then, that the legal procedure indicated by Steele's memorandum is too elaborate to refer to the license. The procedure would surely be consistent, however, with what we know of his obtaining the theatrical patent the following January.

JOHN LOFTIS

University of California, Los Angeles

SMOLLETT AND THE DEATH OF KING WILLIAM III

In his *Complete History of England* Smollett closes his cavalier story of William of Orange with the dramatic account that invites careful scrutiny

On the 8th day of March he expired, in the fifty second year of his age, after having reigned thirteen years. The Lords Lexington and Scarborough, who were in waiting, no sooner perceived the king was dead, than they ordered Ronjat to untie from his left arm, a black ribbon, to which was affixed a ring, containing some hair of the late Queen Mary¹

This passage is doubly interesting: it ascribes no reason for the removal of the ring by Messrs Lexington and Scarborough, and, further, it implies a warm regard of King William for the long-deceased Mary. And what had been Smollett's authority? Apparently only the record of the French historian, Paul de Rapin de Thoyras, whose *Histoire d'Angleterre* ² had been englished and continued by Nicholas Tindal³. Smollett's virtually verbatim transcription fixes Tindal's translation of the French work as the immediate source for the Scotsman's sentimental treatment. Tindal had written

⁸ *Idem*

¹ *A Complete History of England, deduced from the descent of Julius Caesar, to the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle, 1748* . . . , 4 vols (London, 1757-58), I, 330

² 8 vols (The Hague, 1724)

³ 15 vols (London, 1725-31)

Between seven and eight o'clock he [William] began to rattle in his throat, when the commendatory prayer was said for him, and, as it ended, he expired in the arms of Mr Sewell, one of the pages of the backstairs, in the fifty second year of his age, having reigned thirteen years and one month wanting five days. As soon as breath was out of his body, the Lords Lexington and Scarborough, who were then in waiting, ordered Ronjat to take off from the King's arm a black ribbon, which tied next to his skin a gold ring with some hair of the late Queen Mary, which shewed the tender regard he had for her memory.⁴

The story of the ring and its removal is unique with M. Rapin de Thoyras, no source available to him mentions the occurrence.⁵

Smollett's use of Tindal's account of King William's death enjoyed two interesting developments. In 1851 the family of Sutton issued a volume of the private and official correspondence of Robert Sutton, first Lord Lexington, in which Smollett was called to task for his mention of Lord Lexington's part in the removal of the ring.⁶ The editor found the story "totally at variance with Lord Lexington's general character,"⁷ and beyond this consideration, the editor felt it "difficult to conceive an adequate motive for this act, which, in the absence of any explanation, would appear to be one of ill-timed and heartless curiosity."⁸ The second development concerns Macaulay who, in his early contemplation of his *History of England*, and the incident perusal of Smollett, had exclaimed "I spent much of the day over Smollett's *History*. It is exceedingly bad detestably so. I can not think what had happened to him. His carelessness, partiality, passion, idle invective, gross ignorance of facts, and crude general theories, do not surprise me much."⁹ Yet, despite the astute characterization, it is singularly

⁴ *The History of England by Mr. Rapin de Thoyras continued from the Revolution to the Accession of King George II* by N. Tindal, 5 vols (London, 1732-1747), III, 507.

⁵ For a bibliography of pertinent sources see *Bibliography of British History Stuart Period, 1603-1714*. Ed. Godfrey Davies (Oxford, 1928).

⁶ *The Lexington Papers or some account of the Courts of London and Vienna at the conclusion of the Seventeenth Century, extracted from the Official and Private Correspondence of Robert Sutton, Lord Lexington, British Minister at Vienna, 1694-1698*. Selected from the Originals at Kelham, and edited, with notes by the Hon. H. Manners Sutton. London, 1851.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ G. Otto Trevelyan, *Macaulay's Life and Letters* (New York, 1901), II,

trap We'll strip him" ⁸ Despite Byron's enthusiasm, however, Murray did not publish the letter at once, and by the time a year had passed, though Byron was still amused and thought it "inconceivable that he [Roberts] could be so absurd as to think us serious with him," ⁹ he had decided that it was "too late for the letter to Roberts" ¹⁰

During the year following (1821), the *British Review* twice broke the silence The first time was in a rather restrained review of *Marino Faliero* ¹¹ There is too much revenge, blood, and destruction, says the reviewer, and though the "chaste and virtuous" Angiolina is a decided improvement over the usual "Gulnares, the Kaleds, the Parisinas, there is nothing that entwines our heart and its affections" That Byron and the anonymous author of *Don Juan* were commonly suspected to be the same person is not so much as hinted at

On the second occasion the reviewer (presumably Roberts) was by no means so temperate, for in his remarks on cantos 3-5 of *Don Juan*, ¹² he damns the poem as one with "an obvious tendency to loosen the creed, and corrupt the morals of the land" Lengthy denunciations follow, and finally, after denying that his hostility is due to the anonymous author's charge of bribery, he concludes by reasserting his innocence and observing almost tearfully that "the genius which has produced this poetical mischief might as easily have become the friend of humanity, and have thrown an attractive lustre over its charities and its virtues" Again, as in the colorless but generally disparaging review of *Sardanapalus*, ¹³ the name of Lord Byron is not linked with that of the author of *Don Juan*

Three times, then, since Byron had first thrust at Roberts in *Don Juan* (July, 1819) the *British Review* had spoken out against him. Meanwhile three years had passed and Byron, though he had sent the "Wortley Clutterbuck" letter to Murray (August, 1819), had not publicly broken a lance with Roberts At last, however, he did publish it in the first issue of *The Liberal* (October, 1822) as "Letter to the Editor of 'My Grandmother's Review'" ¹⁴ This

⁸ August 23, 1819

⁹ Letter to Murray, October 8, 1820

¹⁰ Letters to Murray, October 12, 1820, and October 25, 1820

¹¹ xvii (June, 1821), 439-52

¹² xviii (December, 1821), 245-65

¹³ xix (March, 1822), 72-102

¹⁴ Why, one may well ask, did Byron wait until the autumn of 1822 to

letter was alternately lambent and bludgeoning. Referring to Roberts' reply to the charge of bribery, Byron writes "You have there most manfully refuted a calumnious accusation of bribery and corruption, the credence of which in the public mind might not only have damaged your reputation as a Clergyman and an editor, but, what would have been still worse, have injured the circulation of your journal" And later, pursuing the same subject, Byron continues "I don't mean to insinuate, God forbid! but if, by any accident, there should have been such a correspondence between you and the unknown author, whoever he may be, send him back his money I dare say he will be very glad to have it again it can't be much, considering the value of the article and the circulation of the journal" Finally, after exculpating Roberts from the charge that "my Grandmother" might allude to the editor-reviewer's "supposed intellectual age and sex," Byron concludes, "You are a good creature, my dear Roberts, and a clever fellow, else I could almost suspect that you had fallen into the very trap set for you in verse by this anonymous Wag, who will certainly be but too happy to see you saving him the trouble of making you ridiculous"

Roberts ponderously sallies forth again, this time in a review of some poems by Bernard Barton So slight, he says, has been his curiosity concerning the letter in the *Liberal* that he has not troubled himself to read it. It is true that his lordship has achieved a momentary "personal triumph," but also it is "universally considered that the attack . . . is in a spirit unworthy of a man of genius, vulgar in its character, and vapid in its execution." Furthermore, he says, he has written evidence that at heart Byron

publish a letter which he had written so gleefully in 1819? A likely explanation may be that he was afraid that he might do something that would lose for him the custody of his daughter, Ada, which, under the terms of the settlement, technically remained with him as father Evidence that this fear was not unconnected with the "Roberts affair" may be found in a letter to Murray, October 8, 1820 After reflecting how stupidly the "British Roberts" has fallen "into the glaring trap laid for him," he continues "Recollect, that if you put my name to *Don Juan* in these canting days, any lawyer might oppose my Guardian right of my daughter in Chancery, on the plea of its containing the *parody*, such are the perils of a foolish jest I was not aware of this at the time, but you will find it correct, I believe, and you may be sure that the Noels would not let it slip Now I prefer my child to a poem at any time "

really respects the *British Review* and is far from "holding its criticisms in contempt" ¹⁵

The last two installments in this exchange appear some months after the death of Lord Byron. In the first, a review of the anonymous *Cato to Lord Byron, on the Immorality of his Writings*, Roberts rises to the occasion with sanctimonious eloquence, asserts his admiration for the genius of the noble bard, declares the principal purpose of the critical reviewer to be that of serving as "a watchman for the moral weal of the community," and concludes by warning others not to emulate Byron lest they, as he has done, founder upon the shoals and end in tragic shipwreck ¹⁶. In the last installment, the *British Review* in commenting on John Sheppard's *Thoughts chiefly designed as a Preparative or Persuasive to Private Devotion* singles out for particular attention the poet's letter to Mr. Sheppard (1821) in respectful acknowledgment of a "prayer" of the late Mrs. Sheppard "evidently alluding to the character and ill-directed talents of Lord Byron" ¹⁷.

And thus ends a long footnote to *Don Juan*. If Byron was looking on from his seat in the nether world to which Roberts consigned him, he may have exclaimed again with Clutterbuck, "The fact is, my dear Roberts, that somebody has tried to make a fool of you, and what he did not succeed in doing, you have done for him and for yourself."

W S WARD

University of Kentucky

WORDSWORTH'S DEBT TO LABORDE'S *VIEW OF SPAIN*

Characteristic of Wordsworth's interest in travel books are his notes acknowledging an indebtedness to Laborde's *View of Spain* in two sonnets of the series, *Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty* ¹. That Wordsworth, who often went to great

¹⁵ xx (December, 1822), 420. The reviewer alleges that "We happen to have before us a very polite letter from his Lordship to our former publisher, expressive of his sense of the value of the paper in that journal on the first part of his 'Childe Harold.'" Ten years and a half, it may be observed, have passed since the publication of this *Childe Harold* review.

¹⁶ xxii (November, 1824), 345-46.

¹⁷ xxiii (May, 1825), 195-96.

¹⁸ "The Oak of Guernica" and "O'erweening Statesmen have full long

lengths in pointing out his borrowings, sometimes forgot to mention them at all, is shown by the very close similarity between another sonnet in the National Independence and Liberty series and a paragraph from Laborde. So far as I know, the resemblance between this sonnet and the following paragraph from Laborde has never been pointed out

In due observance of an ancient rite,
The rude Biscayans, when their children lie
Dead in the sinless time of infancy,
Attire the peaceful corse in vestments white,
And, in like sign of cloudless triumph bright,
They bind the unoffending creature's brows
With happy garlands of the pure white rose
Then do a festal company unite
In choral song, and, while the uplifted cross
Of Jesus goes before, the child is borne
Uncovered to his grave 'tis closed,—her loss
The Mother *then* mourns, as she needs must mourn,
But soon, through Christian faith, is grief subdued
And joy returns, to brighten fortitude

Music, and the appearance of gaiety likewise accompany the funeral [sic] of children. When these die before the age of reason, they are carried uncovered to the burial place, dressed in white, with a crown of white roses on their heads, musicians go before, a young chorister carries the cross, and the followers tumultuously proclaim their joy at the happiness of innocence. The mother subdues her grief, resigning herself to heaven. Whatever pain a Biscayan suffers, his faith renders him patient, and he calmly says "*Dios lo quiere*, it is God's will" ²

To the sonnet beginning "O'erweening Statesmen have full long relied," Wordsworth annexes the following note: "See Laborde's Character of the Spanish people, from him the sentiment of these last two lines is taken." In the fifth volume of his *View of Spain*, Laborde includes a chapter on "Spanish Character and Manners." The following passage is probably the one Wordsworth had in mind:

The national pride is every where the same. The Spaniard has the highest opinion of his nation and himself, which he energetically expresses

relied," *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. E. de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire, Oxford, 1946, III, 136, 138.

² Alexandre de Laborde, *A View of Spain comprising a Descriptive Itinerary of Each Province, and a General Statistical Account of the Country*, Translated from the French, London, 1809, II, 385.

by his gestures, words, and actions. This opinion is discovered in all ranks of life, and classes of society, in crimes and in virtues, amongst the great and the small, under the rags of poverty as much as in the royal palace. Its result is a kind of haughtiness, repulsive sometimes to him who is its object, but useful in giving to the mind a sentiment of nobleness and self-esteem, which fortifies it against all meanness. This pride may be considered as one cause of the great number of persons who quit the world and embrace the ecclesiastical profession. The slightest contempt, the least constraint, often produce on these haughty dispositions the effect of real misfortunes.³

This passage may have supplied the "sentiment," not only of the last two lines, but of almost the whole sonnet. This much at least is similar:

though poor men cleave with pride
To the paternal floor, or turn aside,
In the thronged city, from the walks of gain,
As being all unworthy to detain
A Soul by contemplation sanctified
There are who cannot languish in this strife,
Spaniards of every rank, by whom the good
Of such high course was felt and understood,
Who to their Country's cause have bound a life
Erewhile, by solemn consecration, given
To labour, and to prayer, to nature, and to heaven

CHARLES NORTON COE

University of Idaho

WORDSWORTH'S "THE RUSSIAN FUGITIVE"

In a note to "The Russian Fugitive" Wordsworth writes. "Peter Henry Bruce, having given in his entertaining Memoirs the substance of this Tale, affirms that, besides the concurring reports of others, he had the story from the lady's own mouth." So far as I have been able to discover, the passage in Bruce to which Wordsworth alluded has never been pointed out or commented on. It appears in Book III, pp. 91-94 of the *Memoirs of Peter Henry Bruce*.¹

³ *Ibid*, v. 272-273

¹ *Memoirs of Peter Henry Bruce containing an Account of his Travels in Germany, Russia, Tartary, Turkey, the West Indies, &c. as also Several very interesting Anecdotes of the CZAR, PETER I of Russia*, London, 1782

Wordsworth follows Bruce's account rather closely, omitting a few details and elaborating on others so that his poem has the tone of a medieval narrative of injured innocence. For example, in the story as related by Bruce, the Czar meets a young woman while dining at the house of her father, a foreign merchant

he was so much taken with her appearance, that he offered her any terms she pleased, if she would live with him, which this virtuous young woman modestly refused, but dreading the effects of his authority, she left Moscow in the night, without communicating her design even to her parents (p. 91)

Wordsworth's poem opens with a young woman, whom the poet names Ina, bribing a guard to open the gates of Moscow so that she may escape

Through Moscow's gates, with gold unbarred,
Stepped One at dead of night,
Whom such high beauty could not guard
From meditated blight,
By stealth she passed, and fled as fast
As doth the hunted fawn,
Nor stopped, till in the dappling east
Appeared unwelcome dawn (I 9-16)

She continued her flight and for "Seven nights her course renewed," (I 18) hiding in the fields by day. (In Bruce's version, she merely "travelled on foot several miles into the country, till she arrived at a small village where her nurse lived . . ." p. 91)

In the poem, once her escape has been effected, Ina is concerned, not only for her own safety, but for that of her foster-parents to whom she has fled. Though they insist that "For you we both would die" (I 76), she prefers to hide on an island in the middle of

a treacherous swamp,
On which the noonday sun shed light
As from a lonely lamp (II 10-12)

This "sanctuary . . . From all intrusion free" (II 21-22) is Wordsworth's romantic counterpart of Bruce's, "little dry spot in the middle of a morass [where the nurse's husband, in the prose account] built a hut for her habitation." (p. 91) According to Bruce,

She had deposited her money with her nurse to procure little necessaries for her support, which were faithfully conveyed to her at night by the nurse or her daughter, by one of whom she was constantly attended in the night time (p. 92)

These regular nightly visits Wordsworth changes into rare occasions of delight for the lonely girl dwelling "In solitude" (II 63), taming the birds and cultivating the flowers (III 31-32), and thinking about her parents and her home in France (III 49-80).

And oft, as either Guardian came,
The joy in that retreat
Might any common friendship shame,
So high their hearts would beat,
And to the lone Recluse, whate'er
They brought, each visiting
Was like the crowding of the year
With a new burst of spring (III 41-48)

Ina's self-imposed exile is to last only a year, however, before she is discovered, in Bruce's account by

A colonel who had come from the army to see his friends, going a hunting into that wood, and following his game through the morass came to the hut, and looking into it saw a pretty young woman in a mean dress (p 92)

In the poem Bruce's colonel becomes a hunter endowed with the chivalry of a medieval knight-errant (Wordsworth calls him a "Cavalier," IV 85) When he pursues a wounded deer to the very door of Ina's bower, she decides to throw herself upon his mercy

—"In me
Behold," she said, "a stricken Hind
Pursued by destiny'
From your deportment, Sir' I deem
That you have worn a sword,
And will not hold in light esteem
A suffering woman's word (IV 22-28)

In relating her hardships, she complains not of "the winter's cold" nor "summer's heat," nor yet of her estrangement from "social life" (IV 41-44) Rather, she asserts that

High Heaven is my defence,
And every season has soft arms
For injured Innocence
From Moscow to the Wilderness
It was my choice to come,
Lest virtue should be harbourless,
And honour want a home (IV 46-52)

The hunter at once recognizes her as the lady, "Whose vanishing was rumoured wide, Sad theme for every tongue" (iv 59-60) He immediately falls in love with her and decides to ask Lady Catherine of Russia to intervene in her behalf After he has been assured that the Emperor will grant a full pardon, Ina returns to marry the hunter while "universal Moscow shared The triumph of that hour" (iv 111-112)

Bruce's version differs here in several respects in his account there is no mention of love at first sight, the colonel goes first to the girl's parents, and they together consult Catherine as to how best to broach to the Emperor the subject of the girl's return (p 93) It is Catherine who suggests to the Emperor that "the best amends his majesty could make was to give her a handsome fortune and the colonel for a husband, who had the best right, having caught her in pursuit of his game" (p 93) Wordsworth is sparing in his details of Ina's return, having bent his main effort at depicting her fortitude during the year of exile In the conclusion he merely states that the Emperor, "heart-smitten by the wrong," (iv 93) sent a pledge to the maiden and gave a dowry. Bruce is more explicit in detailing the Emperor's generosity

The czar ordered one of his favourites to go with the colonel, and bring the young lady home The marriage was under the direction, and at the expense of the czar, who himself gave the bride to the bridegroom, saying, that he presented him with one of the most virtuous of women, and accompanied his declaration with very valuable presents, besides settling on her and her heirs, three thousand rubles a year (pp 93-94)

Bruce concludes his story with words similar to those used by Wordsworth in his note to the poem "Besides the concurring reports of other people, I had this her story from her own mouth" (p 94) ²

² Wordsworth borrows one detail for his poem from another section of Bruce's *Memoirs* Describing Ina's lonely life on her island retreat, he writes

To one mute Presence, above all,
Her soothed affections clung,
A picture on the cabin wall
By Russian usage hung—
The Mother-maid, whose countenance bright
With love abridged the day,

One might ask why Wordsworth was interested in this story, and could probably find an answer after analyzing the nature of the changes he made. Why, for instance, did Wordsworth extend the duration of Ina's flight from a mere walk of several miles into an escape requiring seven days to accomplish? And why did he emphasize the loneliness of her retreat, both in describing it and in having her guardians visit her only occasionally? (Remember that in Bruce's account either the nurse or her daughter attended the fugitive every night.) Though the individual changes may seem slight in enumerating them, the net result is something quite different from the essentially narrative presentation of Bruce. In its place, we have a poem where emphasis is laid upon the main character's feelings, where those qualities that Wordsworth thought most worthy of representing are brought to the fore in the personality of his heroine. Ina, a child of low and humble origin, spurns an illicit love match, dwells instead in solitude, lives simply and close to nature, thinks about her home and parents, and puts her trust in heaven. Observe how many of Wordsworth's favorite themes are stressed in this poem: besides the main emphasis upon patient endurance of misfortune (as in *The White Doe*), we find solitude and plain living, the triumph of principle over expediency, and the essential goodness of the common man.

This illustration of Wordsworth's use of an anecdote taken from a travel book to supply him with characters and descriptive details

And, communed with by taper-light,
Chased spectral fears away (III 33 40)

This detail does not appear in Bruce's account of the virtuous young lady summarized above, but that it stems from the *Memoirs* is attested to by the following MS note in Mrs. Wordsworth's handwriting, found by Knight in a copy of the poems: "Not a Russian house, Bruce tells us, was, at his time, without a picture of the Virgin" (See *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. William Knight, Edinburgh, 1885, vii 237). Bruce's account of this Russian custom is as follows: "These images they consider so absolutely necessary, that without them they could not perform their devotion: they are the chief ornament of their houses, and whoever enters, first pays his respects to the saint, and then to those of the family. A Russian once coming to me with a message, looked round about the room for an image, and seeing none, asked me, Where is thy God?—I answered, in heaven: upon which he immediately went away without delivering his message. I told the general this circumstance, and he directly ordered a saint's picture to be hung up in my room, to prevent giving any farther offence of that kind" (p. 103).

for his poetry is not an isolated example. Beginning in 1793 with some of his earliest published poetry, and continuing until 1835, Wordsworth acknowledged in his own notes to his poems borrowings from eighteen or twenty different guide books and books of travel. In "The Complaint of a Forsaken Indian Woman," for example, he did something similar to what he attempted in "The Russian Fugitive." Here too his source was the factual account of an explorer, this time describing an Indian custom of leaving sick members of a roving tribe to die alone in the woods.³ In this earlier poem also, we find that Wordsworth modified the matter-of-fact narrative technique of his source so that the emotions of his chief character become far more important than the incident. This interest in reshaping narrative material to emphasize the character's feelings is in keeping with Wordsworth's poetic credo as expounded in the Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*, where he states that his purpose is "to illustrate the manner in which our feelings and ideas are associated in a state of excitement . . . to follow the fluxes and refluxes of the mind when agitated by the great and simple affections of our nature."

CHARLES NORTON COE

University of Idaho

A NOTE ON WORDSWORTH'S "A MORNING EXERCISE,"

1-18

To line 16 of "A Morning Exercise" Wordsworth appends the following note: "See Waterton's *Wanderings in South America*." One of the passages Wordsworth refers to is given in Knight's edition of *The Excursion*¹ but might be overlooked since Knight's concern is in identifying the "Muccawiss" (*Excursion*, III, 953), and he does not observe that to Waterton, when man is "pensive" and disappointed, the birds' songs will express sympathy, will "take up his tale of sorrow", whereas to Wordsworth, the birds' songs are essentially happy ones. Wordsworth's insistence that

³ See Wordsworth's notes in *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. de Selincourt, Oxford 1944, II 40, and Samuel Hearne's *Journey from Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean*, London 1795, pp. 218-219.

¹ *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. William Knight, Edinburgh 1884, v, 142, 417-19.

Fancy perverts "the evidence of joy" bears out his disapproval of melancholy and his conviction that poets are "the happiest of men" ²

The other passage in Waterton that Wordsworth must have had in mind is the following

Four other species of the Goatsucker articulate some words so distinctly, that they have received their names from the sentences they utter, and absolutely bewilder the stranger on his arrival in these parts Another bids you, "Work away, work-work work-away" A third cries mournfully, "Willy-come-go Willy-Willy-Willy come go" And high up in the country, a fourth tells you to "Whip-poor-Will Whip whip whip poor Will"

You will never persuade the negro to destroy these birds, or get the Indian to let fly his arrow at them They are birds of omen, and reverential dread They are the receptacles for departed souls, who come back again to earth to haunt cruel and hard-hearted masters, and retaliate injuries received from them ³

The second paragraph in this passage from Waterton sheds some light on the rather puzzling third stanza of Wordsworth's poem.

Through border wilds where naked Indians stay,
Myriads of notes attest her subtle skill,
A feathered task-master cries, "WORK AWAY!"
And in thy iteration, "WHIP POOR WILL!" (line 16)
Is heard the spirit of a toil worn slave,
Lashed out of life, not quiet in the grave

CHARLES NORTON COE

University of Idaho

SUT LOVINGOOD AND MARK TWAIN'S *JOAN OF ARC*

Speaking of the folklore element present in the best of Mark Twain's work, Professor Wagenknecht has commented on the "slow accumulation of unconscious observation—absorption" ¹

² See Wordsworth's remarks on "Resolution and Independence" in Christopher Wordsworth's *Memoirs of William Wordsworth*, London 1851, 1, 172-4

³ Charles Waterton, *Wanderings in South America, the North West of the United States, and the Antilles, in the Years 1812, 1816, 1820, and 1824*, London 1825, pp 141-2

¹ Edward Wagenknecht, *Mark Twain the Man and His Work* (New Haven, 1935), p 53

that took place while the artist was storing away material. Gathering into himself the influences of his environment, Mark Twain continued to use traditional frontier humor in literary fields so far removed from Washoe as the France of Joan of Arc. Mi De Voto reminds us that the Paladin was "embroidering the narrative with yarns that are in the strict tradition."² But Mark Twain was not content to stop there. In Chapter XXXVI of the second volume of *Joan of Arc* memory produced the comic incident for Uncle Laxart and the bull, a story based undoubtedly on a yarn told by Sut Lovinggood.

On July 14, 1867, the *Alta California* printed a letter in which Mark Twain said of George W. Harris and his stories of Sut: "I have before me his book, just forwarded by Dick and Fitzgerald, the publishers, New York. It contains all his early sketches, that used to be so popular in the West, together with many new ones."³ One of these Harris sketches, "Sicily Burns's Wedding," was transmuted into an incident in the *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc*. Sut's lengthy narrative is compressed and removed to France, but the essentials are the same: an old man, a bull, a hive of bees, and the breaking up of an occasion. Of course, Uncle Laxart mounts his bull deliberately, while Old Man Burns is unwillingly thrown astride. Laxart's bull is previously undisturbed, but the bull encountered by Burns is already enraged by bee-stings. Although Laxart is the only character in the Twain story, Sut's account of Sicily's wedding details a number of characters. While Harris was content to ruin a wedding, Mark dared to introduce a funeral into his humor. Nevertheless the stories are at heart the same as the following will illustrate.

Uncle Laxart was satisfied, and wanted to get off and go by the next bull or some other way that was quieter, but he didn't dare try	he tore off down the lane to out-run the bees, so durn'd fas' that ole Burns wer feard tu try tu git off
--	---

the bull lost all his temper, and went tearing down the slope with his tail in the air and bellow-	Sock run atwix the hitched critters and the rail-fence, ole Burns fust fitin him over the head wif the
--	--

² Bernard de Voto, *Mark Twain's America* (Boston, 1932), p. 244.

³ Franklin Walker and G. Ezra Dane, ed., *Mark Twain's Travels with Mr. Brown* (New York, 1940), p. 221.

ing in the most awful way, and just in the edge of the village he knocked down some beehives, and the bees turned out and joined the excursion

they came roaring through the village like a hurricane, and took the funeral procession right in the center, and sent that section of it sprawling, and galloped over it, and the rest scattered apart and fled screeching in every direction, every person with a layer of bees on him, and not a rag of that funeral left but the corpse⁴

baskit tu stop him, an then fitn the bees wif it I'll jus' be durn'd ef I didn't think he hed four ur five baskits, hit wer in so meny places at onst

Well, Burns, baskit, an' bull, an' bees, skared every durn'd hoss an' muel loos frum that fence—bees ontu all ove 'em, bees, by golly, everywhar A heavy cloud ove dus' like a harycane hed been blowin, hid all the hosses, an' away abuv hit yu cud see tails, an' ainds ove fence-rails a-flyin about .⁵

In both accounts the unfortunate rider, mounted on a bull, and accompanied by a swarm of bees, succeeds in sweeping all before him. Perhaps Mark Twain's remembrance of this old joke of Sut Lovingood's shows how much these stories were native to frontier humor and an unconscious part of memories of Western days

E. HUDSON LONG

Vanderbilt University

GURIPA

Durante la guerra civil española la palabra *guripa*, 'soldado,' se hizo muy popular sobre todo entre los combatientes. Se oían con frecuencia en el ejército frases como éstas *esto lo hacen mis guripas, se va con cualquier guripa, ¡eh, tú, guripa, ven acá!*, etc. La palabra debía haber vivido una vida subterránea en el "argot" cuartelero y distaba bastante de ser una voz muy extendida, ya que muchos movilizados no la conocían de su servicio militar anterior. Y, sin embargo, esta palabra de origen gitano era, en esta acepción, fiel a su etimología, lo que hace pensar que con ella se incorporó primero al lenguaje popular español. En efecto, habrá que rela-

⁴ *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc* (New York and London, 1899), II, 73-74

⁵ Franklin J. Meinie, ed., *Tall Tales of the Southwest* (New York, 1930), p. 348

cionar *guripa* con la raíz gitana *kūr*- emparentada con formas indias antiguas y modernas *kutti*, *kutter*, *kutna*, 'to crush,' 'to beat,' 'to strike,' etc (vease J Sampson, *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*, Oxford 1926, p 162), *guripa* procede sin duda alguna del nombre de acción *kuripen*, *kuriben*, 'fight,' 'battle,' que se encuentra representado en varios dialectos gitanos F Miklosich, *Ueber die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner*, VII, Wien, 1877, p 88, da distintas formas de la palabra *kurepe*, *kunbe*, *kuroben*, *kurripá*, y también alguna forma con *g*- en otros derivados *guo-maskro*, *guimaskrom*, 'Soldat,' 'Krieger.' R Liebich, *Die Zigeuner in ihrem Wesen und in ihrer Sprache*, Leipzig, 1863, p 241, registra las formas *kurapáskero*, *garapáskero*, 'Soldat,' 'Schutze' El verbo y sus derivados se encuentran en el vocabulario de *The Zincah* de G Borrow *curar*, 'pegar, hacer, trabajar,' en relación con el hindú *guhrna*, *cueló*, 'trabajo, pena', *currando*, 'martillo', *curriel*, 'oficio, trade, business' Los diccionarios gitano españoles posteriores dan *cuar*, *curarar*, *currelar*, con los significados de 'pegar,' 'trabajar' Este último significado parece haberse impuesto en la lengua de los gitanos españoles (comp la idea de 'trabajo' y 'esfuerzo' implícita en frases proverbiales y modismos castellanos *con el mazo dando*, *dándole aquí a esto*, *dale que te pego*, etc). *guripa* constituye, pues, una antigua forma aislada a la que seguramente se llegó por analogía con algunos nombres de agente españoles que adoptan la forma de los nombres de acción del verbo correspondiente como *guardia*, *cua*, etc. Puede haber también una vaga probabilidad de que el antiguo vocativo gitano en *-a* (del que conservamos un resto en la voz popular española *chavea*-) contribuyera quizá a la cristalización de la forma

En los textos literarios, sin embargo, *guripa* no significa 'soldado,' sino 'golfo.' No es difícil imaginarse la evolución semántica teniendo en cuenta el tono despectivo que envuelven todas las denominaciones del militar sin graduación que se emplean en español *soldado raso*, *quinto*, *recluta*, *número*, *individuo*, y hasta el argótico *sorche*. Partiendo de aquí es sencillo explicar el paso a las expresiones populares *sujeto*, *tipo*, *cualquiera*, *tío*, que tan cerca andan de las denominaciones más específicas de los miembros del hampa madrileña De hecho, para los que conocieron la palabra *guripa* durante los años de 1936 a 1939 resulta difícil determinar el valor estrictamente militar del término En las frases citadas al

principio, *mis guripas* podría interpretarse fácilmente como ‘mi gente,’ ‘mis hombres’, *con cualquier guripa*, ‘con uno (de esos),’ ‘con un (infeliz) cualquiera’, el vocativo *guripa* equivale al ‘muchacho’ con que se interpela a los soldados en los cuarteles españoles. En esta zona vaga parece encontrarse la palabra en algunos de los textos. Por ej. M. Muzas & J. López Barbadillo, *Los ochavos*, Madrid 1910, p. 29: “Pues duro con la danza de la ¡Jipa’/ya que es el baile que le gusta a este guripa”. Los autores le hacen cantar esto a Don Olegario, viejo de corazón alegre, dispuesto a salir de juerga hacia la Bombilla con dos jóvenes amigas de su hijo que bailan con él el baile mencionado en el texto. Don Olegario dice *este guripa* por *este cura*, es decir, *a uno*, él mismo. Pero *guripa* debió arraigar para designar a los *granujillas*, *pilletes*, *mangantes*, etc. de la picaresca moderna de la Corte que los sameteros se complacían en trasladar a la escena en los últimos años del siglo XIX y primeros del XX. En una zarzuela, cuyo título indica ya el medio en que se desarrolla, C. Arniches & J. Jackson Veyán, *Los granujas*, Madrid 1908, p. 29 y s., nos describen, por boca del protagonista *Cañamón*, la vida de ese espécimen de los bajos fondos madrileños, en una canción “que es la última novedad”:

Allá va la canción del guripa
 que hace un mes no llena la tripa,
 hasta ayer que le dió por chiripa
 un triste bunuelo la señá Felipa
 Con sus moños y más fachada
 que va Barroso por esas calles,
 va el guripa por los Madriles
 aunque se encuentre lloviendo a mares
 Si la gente tiritita de frío
 no le importa ni un comino al randa,
 pues en un abrir de ojos se arregla
 con dos *Heraldos* una bufanda
 y una pueita o un banco del Prado,
 ¡ay, Jesús bendito!
 al granuja le sirven pa que eche
 algún sueñecito
 ¡Ay, pobre golfito! ¡Ay, pobre golfito!
 Pero todo se lo pasa bailando
 o pidiendo limosna el guripa,
 pues se queda la gente admirando
 como estira y encoge la tripa .

Por el día va a la parada,

vendiendo prensa por la noche,
y un paseo de vez en cuando
da en la trasera de cualquier coche

Siguen algunos detalles más acerca de sus actividades y manera de vivir de menos importancia. Pero para acabar de tener un cuadro completo de la existencia de estos personajes no hay más que traer a colación una composición del gran poeta S. Rueda, incluida en un librito suyo titulado *Sinfonía callejera*, Madrid 1893, p. 57 y ss (también en *Poesías completas*, Barcelona s. a., p. 157 y ss), que se titula precisamente *El "guripa"*

Movible como burbuja,
como una sonaja alegre,
más tracionero que astuto,
más astuto que valiente,
en revueltas y motines
amigo de entrometerse,
de toda riña testigo,
en todo lance presente,
el "golfo" de los Madriles
da, como decirse suele,
la hora en el reloj ajeno
que a la mano se le viene

No siendo nada, lo es todo
Madrid entero es su albergue,
su cama está en cada puerta,
su vaso está en cada fuente
Amigo de las charangas
y de desfiles lucentes

Sonando con pedestales
que lo luzcan y lo eleven,
en cualquier bronco tumulto
a los faroles asciende
Antes que le apunte el bozo,
enamora, juega y bebe,
y se pega dos *moiradas*
con quien dárselas quisiere
Tiene vela en todo entierro,
y si cualquier fiesta huele,
aunque no lo invite nadie,
por cualquier parte se mete
De *El Liberal*, a quien ama,
algun *veintimco* vende,
no por lucro, por la mira

de que se ilustre la gente
 Para probar que es humilde
 en un andrajo se envuelve,
 y quitarselo no intenta
 hasta que el se le desprende
 Usa gorra desgarrada
 y los tufos a las sienes,
 y maneja el diccionario
 que usaría *Rinconete*
 A la sombra de la carcel
 acostumbra a estar a veces,
 y es que entonces *no recibe*
 y *se queda* porque quiere
 Este hechicero prodigio
 no usa nombre y tiene siete
 granuja, charrán, guripa,
 rata, golfo, tuno y peine

Cieo que sea difícil encontrar textos que describan mejor un tipo social y algo que nos dé con mayor exactitud el valor y significado de la palabra que estas romantizaciones de la "golfemia" madrileña de hace unos años. Era tan claro el significado de *guripa* para los que gustaban de esos medios y los idealizaban y popularizaban a través de la literatura costumbrista, que la palabra con mayúscula sirve ya para designar el tipo, mejor, el prototipo del golfo. P. de Répide, *Estampas grotescas*, Madrid s a, p 55, en un cuadro en verso titulado *El Tupi*, en que unos parroquianos discuten con el mozo, se le dice a uno de ellos, representante de todo su "genero" "No te alteres, Guripa". A Torres del Alamo & A Asenjo, *Postineries*, Madrid, s a, p 117 y ss, titulan uno de sus capítulos *El "Guripa," literato, o Esas no volverán*. La escena tiene lugar en los barrios bajos y termina con una parodia de Becquer con intención satírico-política, y en ella *El "Guripa"* con otro golfo llamado *El "Chupaescorza"* disertan como madrileños de su "clase". Encontramos también *guripa* como epíteto en J Lopez Silva, *De rompe y rasga*, Barcelona s a, p 187. Un cortejo termina así "¡Adios, sangre! ¡Adios, guripa!" La mujer le llama al hombre *guripa*, medio en serio, medio en broma. Lo mismo que *golfo*, *chulo*, *granuja*, etc, la palabra ha dejado de ser termino insultante o despectivo para mostrar un lado positivo de gracia y desfachatez que corresponde a la literarización y exaltación de los tipos populares madrileños.

CARLOS CLAVERÍA

University of Pennsylvania

CASKET, CASK

As to the origin of *casket* (first attested 1467) the *NED* remarks

Of uncertain etymology the form suggests a dim of *Cask*, but *casket* occurs earlier than *cask*, and is without precedent as to meaning in Fr or other lang [the meaning being 'a small box or chest for jewels, letters, or other things of value, itself often of valuable material and richly ornamented']

Of *cask* we are told

app a F *casque* masc 'the head piece turned a caske' (Cotgr) ad Sp *casco* 'a caske or burgonet, also a head, a pate, a skonce, an earthen pot, sheard or galley cup' (Minsheu), which Diez thinks derived from *cascar* to break into pieces, with the original sense of 'something broken, sheird' The meaning 'head piece, burgonet' coincides with sense 4 ['a head-piece or helmet,' first attested in 1580], but sense 1 ['barrel,' first attested in the first half of the 16th cent] appears only in Eng, and its origin is not clear

The *REW*, s v **quassicare*, also explains Fr *casque* 'helmet' as a 16th-century loan-word from Sp. *casco* this word is semantically richer ('potsheard,' 'head' etc) than Fr *casque*, and all the meanings are easily enough derived from a vulgar Latin **quassicare* 'to shake, break etc'

But if it be true that Fr *casque* 'helmet' is a loan-word from Spanish, this fact alone would make it highly unlikely that our Eng *casket* 'box of jewels' (1467) and *cask* 'barrel' (first half of the sixteenth century) could have any direct connection with the French word—for Spanish loan-words rarely appear in French (and still less so, in English) as early as the fifteenth century It must then, either be shown that the French word does not come from Spanish, or else another etymology than Fr. *casque* must be found for the English word[s]

First, however, the statement of the *NED* to the effect that our *cask*-family does not appear in other languages with the meanings 'box, chest,' 'barrel' is not true the *Dict général* lists (unfortunately, without giving the date of first appearance) a technical meaning of Fr *casque* 'assemblage de bandes de fer courbées qui servait à transporter les boulets rouges' (Lattre gives a slightly

different definition 'espèce de grande cuiller pour transporter les boulets rouges,' but it is well known that the *Dict gén* is superior to Littré in its definitions)—a meaning very close to that of 'barrel.' Moreover, in Spanish, we find a *casco* 'tonel, pipa o botella que sirve para contener líquidos' (*Dicc. de la Acad esp*), i e 'barrel'

But apart from these semantic parallels, still more can be added to the treatment of the Romance *cask* family offered in the *NED*. Our knowledge of the ramifications of this word family has increased since the time of Diez for example, the *REW* notes s v **quassicare* that this Vulgar Latin word family has blended with that of Lat *cusculum* (*cusculum*), a word attested in Pliny in the meaning 'the scarlet berry of the holm-oak,' and obviously taken over by Vulgar Latin in the more general meaning 'berry,' since many Romance derivatives testify to this meaning (indeed, some of the Spanish forms appear in the *REW* listed now s v *cusculum*, now s v **quassicare*). In his study of this family, Meyer-Lubke has drawn heavily (without saying so) on the masterly treatment of *cusculum* by Schuchardt in his *Baskisch und Romanisch* (1906), pp 10-15, here are listed numerous derivatives from *cusculum* to be found in Provençal, Basque and Spanish—that is, attested in the habitat of that Mediterranean tree, the holm-oak (*quercus ilex*). These are arranged by Schuchardt in a semantic scale ranging from (1) *bodies* to (2) *surfaces* to (3) *lines*

- 1 'Korperrundes, Kuglichtes und aus einem grosseren Korper Hervorragendes' [meanings such as 'bubble,' 'cocoons,' 'testicles,' 'little bells,' 'pebble,' 'piece']
2. 'Flachenrundes, Gewolbtes und zwar Umschliessendes' [meanings such as 'shell,' 'skin of a fruit,' 'bark,' 'cup of the acorn,' 'skull,' 'pod,' 'sheath of a dagger']
- 3 'Linnenrundes, Kreis- oder Spiralformiges' [meanings such as 'curl,' 'ring,' 'notch']

We are here mainly concerned with the meanings listed under (2) 'shell' (attested by O Prov [14th c] *cascolha* [mod. Prov. *cascolho*], Basque *kaskal*, Sp *cascarón*) and 'skull' (a meaning obviously derived from 'shell' [cf Germ *Hirnschale*])—attested by Sp. *casco*, Basque *kasko*, *kasket*). In the *kask*- forms we must recognize back formations from *koskól*- (dissimilated to **kaskól* o-ó > a-ó, as in Prov. *cafórc* < co[n]furcum, Sp. *caracol* < **cochúlea*, *cochlea*),—or, better, *(*kosk*-) **kask*- stems originating

from (**koskól-*) '*kaskól*'¹ Schuchardt, like Meyer-Lubke, allowed for an influence of **quassicare* on the -a- forms in general, and Sp *casco* 'potsherd' must surely be derived from *quassicare*. As for Sp *casco* 'helmet' we can no longer assume that its sole etymon is *casco* 'potsherd' (in line with the development Lat *tesla* > Fr *tête*), it could just as easily come from *casco* 'shell, skull' (< *cuscolum*)² The Basque *kasket*, with diminutive suffix -et, unquestionably of Romance origin, found in Schuchardt's list only in the meaning 'skull,' may point to a Prov '*casquet* 'shell,' 'skull' (This word is not attested, but we may remember that the important Prov *cascolha* itself is only a hapax in a 14th century text)

Prov. *casquet* could have been borrowed by French in the same meaning 'shell, case,' of which Eng *casket* 'shell, case' [s v *casket* 3b] would be the direct reflection. The additional meanings 'barrel' (found both in Fr *casque* ['barrel to transport bullets'] and Eng *cask*) and 'jewel-box, case' could be simply a further semantic development of the same Prov loan-word *casquet* 'shell, skull' again, from 'skull' or 'shell' one comes easily to 'casing for the head, helmet'. It is interesting that, at the beginning of the 16th century, the French form with -et was more frequent in the meaning 'helmet' than was *casque* itself (Gay, *Dict arch*, Huguet) and it is also true that the English form *casket* (though in the meaning 'box, case') was attested earlier (15th c) than *cask* (16th c), this fact would suggest that, in both languages the simple form is a back formation from the -et form. It is even possible that the primacy of the -et form obtained also in Provençal and Basque. The Basque *kasket*, which we used as our starting point, could have been prior to *kasko*, mentioned above—representing, that is, simply the substitution of the suffix -et for the suffix -ol [< Lat. -olum] *kaskól* > *kaskét*. From *casquet*, conceived as a diminutive, the simple *casque* [*cask*] was extracted.²

LEO SPITZER

¹ For Sp *casco* in all its meanings ('skull,' 'potsherd' and 'helmet') Migliorini, AR XIX, 129 proposes, without discussing Schuchardt's etymon *cuscolum*, a **capsicum* from *capsa* 'capsule, box,' comparing semantically It *coccio* '(broken) receptacle'—South It *coccia* 'head'. But according to this suggestion, we would have to separate from Sp *casco* the Prov *cascolha* which doubtless goes back to *cuscolum*.

² The regressive formations may have been encouraged by the presence of the two representatives of the synonymous word family *concha*—*conchylum* (Fr *coque*—*coquille*)

GEOFFROY SAINT-HILAIRE A TRANSLATOR OF
GOETHE?

Rudolf Steiner, the editor of Goethe's *Naturwissenschaftliche Schriften* in the *DNL*, makes the following statement in regard to Goethe's summary of the famous debate between Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire and Cuvier "Eine Übersetzung desselben [1 e of the *Principes de Philosophie Zoologique*,¹ discutés en Mars 1830 au sein de l'académie royale des sciences par Mr Geoffroy de Saint-Hilaire] ist 1831 in den 'Annales des sciences naturelles' unter dem Titel 'Réflexions de Goethe sur les débats scientifiques de mars 1830 dans le sein de l'Académie de Sciences, publiées à Berlin dans les Annales de critique scientifique' ² von Geoffroy de St Hilaire selbst" ³

Information taken from various sources makes it now appear quite unlikely that it was Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire himself who translated from the German account of Goethe the substance of his own debate with Cuvier and most likely that this work was done by M Bohtlingk, a hitherto unrecorded translator of a work of Goethe.⁴ Steiner himself does not repeat in the *W A* his reference to Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire's translation ⁵ Vol xxii (I^e Serie) of the *Annales des sciences naturelles*, in which appeared the translation of Goethe's summary to which Steiner refers, merely states in a footnote "Les présentes réflexions nous ont été communiquées par M Geoffroy."⁶ That this statement does not imply a translation is made clear by the following citation taken from Goethe's *Paraphomena* 112 "Im December 1830 wird in der *Revue médicale* ⁷ eine französische Übersetzung [of Goethe's *Principes de Phil Zool*] abgedruckt. So auch dieselbe im Februar 1831 in den *Annales des*

¹ *W A* II Abt Bd 7, S 167-214

² *Berliner Jahrbuch für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, 1830, 2 Bd Sept No 52/53

³ *DNL*, Bd 114 Goethes Werke Bd xxxiii, S 385-6

⁴ Neither Goedeke nor Baldensperger lists Bohtlingk as translator of *Principes des Phil Zoologique*

⁵ *W A* II Abt Bd 7, S 230

⁶ *Annales des Sciences Naturelles* par MM Adouin, Ad Brongniart et Dumas, t xxii (I^e Serie), Paris Crochard, Libraire-Éditeur, 1831, p 179

⁷ *Revue Médicale Française et Étrangère* Paris 1830, t iv, pp 445-447

sciences naturelles"⁸ Since Goethe himself points out that the translation in the *Annales des sc nat* is a reprint of the translation from the *Revue médicale*, it appears quite unlikely that Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire is the translator of the version appearing in the *Annales des sc nat*

An entry in Goethe's *Tagebuche* likewise seems to exclude the possibility that Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire translated Goethe's summary of the famous debate "Sendung von Paris in Bezug auf Streitigkeiten von St Hilaire, besonders aber ein kurzer Aufsatz des letzteren,"⁹ meine naturwissenschaftlichen Studien betreffend"¹⁰ No reference here is made to a translation by St Hilaire, an omission which would have been unthinkable when one considers how deeply and humbly Goethe appreciated Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire's every reaction to his scientific works and theories

In the *Revue bibliographique des Sc naturelles* of 1831 a review of Soret's translation of Goethe's *Essai sur la métamorphose des plantes*¹¹ contains a reference to St Hilaire's "article sur [les] travaux scientifiques [de Goethe]," but none to the translation ascribed to St. Hilaire by Steiner, although the translation preceded Saint-Hilaire's article in the same publication

Finally the fact that neither Goedeke nor Baldensperger mentions Saint-Hilaire as translator of Goethe's summary may perhaps be taken as additional testimony that Steiner was wrong in ascribing the translation to him

There is, however, a contemporary translator who is likely to be the originator of the translation almost identical versions of which appeared in the *Annales des Sc Nat*, in the *Revue Médicale*, and in the series of books called *Paris, ou Le Livre des Cent et Un*.¹² The editors of this last mentioned work clearly credit the transla-

⁸ *Annales des sc nat*, t xxii, pp 179-188

⁹ "Sur des Ecrits de Goethe lui donnant des droits au titre de savant naturaliste" *Ibid*, pp 188-193

¹⁰ *W A III* Abt. Bd 13, S. 80

¹¹ *Annales des Sc Nat*, op cit, Vol xxiv, p. 33 (An unrecorded review of Goethe's *Essai sur la métamorphose etc* as trsl by Soret)

¹² *Paris, ou Le Livre des Cent et Un* A Paris, Chez Ladvocat [1832], Vol v, 243-65 Goethe's summary of the *Principes de Phil Zool* appears in this volume under the title "Les Naturalistes Français, ou Méditations de Goethe sur la marche et le caractère philosophique des sciences naturelles à Paris"

tion to a M Bohtlingk ¹³ "Nous sommes redevables à M Bohtlingk de la traduction du dernier écrit de Goethe." ¹⁴ Entry 658 in t. 62 of the Bibl Nat catalogue and an entry in P Lacombe's *Bibliographie Parisienne* ¹⁵ confirm the fact that Bohtlingk is indeed the translator of Goethe's summary of the *Principes de Phil Zool*, certainly of the translation which appeared in the *Livre des Cent et Un* ¹⁶

Since the translation in *Paris, ou Le Livre des Cent et Un* is essentially the same as that of the *Annales des Sc Nat*, which in turn is identical with the even earlier publication in the *Revue Médicale*, M Bohtlingk rather than Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire should be considered the translator of Goethe's summary of the *Principes de Philosophie Zoologique* ¹⁷

ERICH A. ALBRECHT

Newcomb College,
Tulane University

A CONTEMPORARY JUDGMENT ON MOLIERE

So far as this writer knows, no bibliographer of Molière has mentioned the rare "Les Medecins à la Censure, ou Entretiens sur la Medecine" by G Bezangon, *Paris, Gontier*, 1677, 370 pp, wherein the author, himself a "docteur en medecine," devotes five pages to proving (?) that Molière really venerated the Medical Art, and that his plays are not the expression of his true beliefs

Bezangon attempts to show that well-known censors of physicians—Petrarch and Montaigne for example, along with Molière—either erred, or were only joking when they made their strictures The book is composed of several long chapters called "Entretiens" in which "Cléante" plays the part of a judicious doubting Thomas, assuring his friend "Sosandre" that all public opinion and knowledge are against the latter's contention, that the noted writers in question really revered Medecine and its Practitioners, but never-

¹³ Very likely N D Bohtlingk who published a translated excerpt of Daru's *Histoire de la République de Venise*, St Petersburg, 1824

¹⁴ Paris, ou *Le Livre des Cent et Un*, op cit, v, p 243

¹⁵ Lacombe, Paul, *Bibliographie Parisienne* (Paris Rouquette, Libraire, 1887), p 112

¹⁶ Paris, ou etc, pp 243 265

¹⁷ W A II Abt Bd 7, S 167-214

theless he is willing to listen to what Sosandre has to say. The latter confidently states his case, and of course when he is through, "Personne ne trouve de replique." A third character, "Cariste," is also present and makes remarks.

It is interesting to see what a contemporary doctor, familiar with the plays of Molière, has to say about him, the more so since Bezaçon handles the traducers of his profession with great forbearance, and even praises them for their wit and ability. Also, I do not know whether anyone since Bezaçon has ever singled out for emphasis the passage from Molière on which the doctor bases his contention. It must be admitted that he has a point there.

On p. 266 we read "Et dans ce dernier siècle n'avons nous pas vu un Poète fameux qui a revelé leurs [of physicians] tromperies & leurs homicides?"

I quote pp. 309-313 of Bezaçon: "Cela me fait souvenir de Molière qui l'a imité (Petrarch) de bien près en ses satyres et en sa mort, tout ce qui est de grand dans le monde il l'a joué."

"Il est vray, dit Cariste, mais il estoit particulièrement dechaisné contre la Médecine, elle estoit en butte à tous ses traits."

"Il a poussé, dit Cleante, son caractère jusques au bout, et jamais il n'est revenu du mépris de la Médecine. On ne trouvera, je crois, dans ses ouvrages gueres de contradictions sur ce point. Cependant vous nous ferez voir, Sosandre, qu'il n'a pas seulement effleuré cette science, franchement j'ay la dernière curiosité pour une merveille si surprenante."

"Je ne doute point, répondit Sosandre, qu'en plusieurs de ses pièces, il n'ait joué les Médecins et la Médecine même. Il remarquoit que le peuple prenoit goût à ces sortes de satyres, il a suivi son inclination, et il y faisoit bien ses affaires. mais soyez sûr qu'il parloit contre ses sentimens, le fond de son cœur tenoit pour cette science utile, lors même que ses grimaces la décrioient. Vous vous imaginez que je dis ceci gratis. Je veux que vous n'en croyez que Molière même. J'en ay decouvert la preuve nette et decisive en un endroit de ses écrits, fort propre à satisfaire votre grande curiosité, c'est en la préface de la comédie du Tartuffe où il parle ainsi: (Qu'est ce que dans le monde on ne corrompt point tous les jours, il n'y a chose si innocente, où les hommes ne puissent porter du crime, point d'art si salutaire dont il ne soit capable de renverser les intentions, rien de si bon en soy qu'il ne puisse tourner à de mauvais usages, la Médecine est un art profitable, chacun la revere comme une des plus excellentes choses que nous ayons, cependant il y a eu des temps où elle s'est rendue odieuse.)¹

"Un témoignage si favorable à la Médecine, sorty d'une bouche qui a tant

¹ [Bezaçon does not complete Molière's sentence, which adds "et souvent on en a fait un art d'empoisonner les hommes." Should the completed sentence be regarded as praise of the medical profession?—H. C. L.]

crié contre elle, n'est à mon avis gueres suspect une preface est un lieu où l'auteur parle serieusement et de sens rassis Dans une piece comique la plaisanterie et la fiction peuvent donner un tour force a ses pensees, mais dans cet endroit la raison revenue de toutes les saillies poetiques parle toute seule On ne peut point attribuer le passage que je viens de rapporter au caractere particulier d'un acteur Moliere avoit dressé cette preface pour expliquer a tout le peuple ses veritables sentimens sur la religion, que sa comédie du Tartuffe avoit rendus suspects, il ne parle point là en Poete ny en comedien c'est le seul endroit où il s'explique en Chrestien et en Philosophe C'est pourquoy il est sans doute plus propre à nous marquer ses veritables intentions, que tous les autres textes qu'on pourroit tirer du corps de ses Comedies

"Personne ne trouva de replique à un passage si formel Ainsi Sosandre se preparoit "

ROBERT E PIKE

Augsburg, Germany

RACINE AND "LE COCUAGE DE MOLIERE"

Unknown to bibliographers of both Racine and of Molière there seems to have existed a book (whether a poem, a play or a satire, nobody knows) published by the former a year before the death of the latter and entitled "*Le Cocuage de Moliere*"

The sole reference to this stimulating work (how indeed can it fail to stimulate the imagination of all good scholars?) is found in the meticulous "*Table du Recueil Jamet*," a bound manuscript, of which the only copy is hidden away in the Réserve at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, under the call-number "Usuels de la Réserve AA83" and does not appear in any Catalogue of the Library

F-I Jamet (1710-1778) was a bibliophile of vast learning and of by no means ordinary tastes He published very little, but busied himself collecting small rare works (printed), in making copies of others, and then, having covered the margins with a profusion of erudite and curious notes, he bound them together into volumes, which, unhappily, were dispersed after his death

These volumes he entitled "Stromates" or "Chaos," and some of them are truly chaotic The "*Table du Recueil*," however, is a very careful work, listing the pieces in each volume In it one finds a lot of otherwise unknown material, for example on Rabelais, on Voltaire, and on Molière

The "*Table du Recueil*" lists 204 volumes or "Tomes" and

their contents Tome 80 (p 92 of the "Table") has, as its last item, "Le Cocuage de Moliere par le celebre racine 1672," and opposite this entry, on the same page, we read "(cinq ou six portraits de racine et beaucoup de notes)"

Unfortunately, nothing more concerning this provoking opus has been found The BN possesses 27 volumes of the "Stromates" in the Réserve, and six more volumes are in the Manuscript Dept at the same Library The *Arsenal* possesses some nine volumes, and others are known to exist But the celebrated Racine's cerebrations on his colleague's *cocuage* have so far escaped detection Perhaps publication of this note will encourage someone with more facilities than the writer to go hunting for it Certainly it would be a valuable find

ROBERT E PIKE

Augsburg, Germany

LA FÉE MORGAIN ET LES CHRONIQUES GARGANTUINES

Les *chroniques gargantunes*, qui rattachent l'histoire du géant Gargantua au cycle de la Table Ronde, mentionnent plusieurs fois la fée Morgain elle est la marraine de Gargantua et celui-ci est transporté,¹ après sa mort, en 'faerie,' où se trouve Morgain Les *grandes croniques* se terminent sur ce passage

Et ainsi vesquit Gargantua au service du Roy Aituz l'espace de deux cens ans troys moys et un jour justement Puis fut porte en faerie par gain la phee, et Melusine, avecques plusieurs aultres lesquelz y sont de present²

¹ Rabelais a conservé ce dernier trait 'Pantagruel ouvrt nouvelles que son pere Gargantua avoit esté translate au pays des Phees par Morgue' *Pantagruel*, éd crit p V L Saulnier (Paris, 1946), p 125 (ch xv) — Sur les variantes du nom de la fée Morgain, cf H Newstead, 'The traditional background of *Partonopeus de Blois*,' *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 916-946 — L A Paton, *Studies in the fairy mythology of Arthurian Romance* (Boston, 1903), pp 255-258

² *Les oeuvres de maistre François Rabelais*, éd Ch Marty-Laveaux (Paris, 1881), IV, 50 — *Les croniques du roy Gargantua* (aujourd'hui à Montpellier) sont ici semblables aux *Grandes Croniques* 'il fut porte par Morgain la fee et Melusine en faerie' (cf H Omont, *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres Comptes rendus* [Paris, 1906], pp 187-192)

Pour *Le vroy Gargantua*,³ comme pour *Les croniques admirables*,⁴ c'est Merlin qui transporta Gargantua

en fauye ou estoit la le roy artur ou ilz viuent encore Et font grant chere
Au chasteau dauallon

Seule, *La grande et merueilleuse vie* semble, d'abord, ne contenir aucun élément arthurien, le premier chapitre, pourtant, décrit la mère de Gargantua.

Sa mere fut une dame moult notable et de grant stature la plus belle qu'on eust sceu regarder des deux yeulx Et fut dune isle pres la grant mere oceane

M le professeur R S Loomis, dans un de ses brillants articles sur la fée Morgain, a rappelé que, comme l'avait prouvé Kittredge, le nom d'*Olyroun* a souvent été substitué à celui d'*Avalon*, et il a ajouté 'This isle [Olyroun] is, of course, Oléron, off the French coast'⁵ Ne semble-t-il pas, dès lors, que l' 'isle pres la grant mere oceane' doit être l'île d'Oléron qui a été confondue avec Avalon où résidait la fée Morgain?

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

A NOTE ON SPENSER'S USE OF TROPE

Confronted by the tree passage in *The Faerie Queene*, I, i, 8-9, scholars and critics have generally offered one of two explanations. Either they have seen classic influence and have ferreted out a list of parallel passages from Ovid, Seneca, Lucan, Statius, Virgil, Tasso, Chaucer, and others, or they have fallen back on praise loud enough to make the reader forget matters of coherence. The first answer ignores the aesthetic problem of propriety, the second is embarrassed by it.¹

³ f. dmu^{ro}

⁴ Cf. P. Plan, *Bibliographie rabelaisienne* (Paris, 1904), p. 25 et *La seconde chronique de Gargantua et de Pantagruel*, ed. P. Lacroix (Paris, 1872), p. 117. « Merlin [] le vint querir et le transporta en Faerie, ou estoit jà allé le bon Roy Artus avec sa seur Morgain, Ogier le Dannois et Huon de Bordeaulx, ou ilz vivent encores et font grant chere au chasteau d'Avallon »

⁵ 'Morgain la fée and the celtic goddesses,' *Speculum*, xx (1945), 183-203

¹ See *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition* (Baltimore,

But the list has a more vital function. Before Spenser launches into the tree list, he says that Una and Redcrosse are led by pleasure—they hear the birds, then they see the trees. The stanza immediately following the tree list reads

Led with delight, they thus beguile the way,
Vntill the blustering storme is ouerblowne,
When weening to return, whence they did stray,
They cannot finde that path, which first was showne,
But wander too and fro in ways unknowne,
Furthest from end then, when they nearest weane,
That makes them doubt, their wits be not their owne

And in stanzas 12 and 13, just before Redcrosse fights with the dragon, Una warns him that he should not be rash, that "Oft fire is without smoke,/ And perill without show," and that she knows the place better than he. Thus, before the tree passage, Spenser indicates that Redcrosse is misled by pleasure, after the list, Redcrosse doubts if he is in possession of his wits, and from Una's mouth, we learn that he cannot distinguish the apparent from the real. Behind this concept of pleasure leading man away from reason and into error lies part of the whole tradition of faculty psychology. From Plato on, philosophers have distrusted pleasure. As Spenser's contemporary, Thomas Rogers, put it, pleasure "be-longeth not unto a reasonable creature, or vnto one of confirmed rudgemēt. Plato sayth it is the foode of filthinesse, for it dulleth the witte, weakeneth the rudgment, and taketh away understanding" ² According to Aristotle and his successors, the first impulse of a passion must come from the pleasures (or pains) of the senses. The passions, in turn, can cause a man to abandon his noblest faculty, his reason. In *De Somniis*, moreover, Aristotle pointed out that these very passions may corrupt the perceptions, and hence lead a man to error ³ Thus, a man can be led into error by two interrelated causes. 1) he may be led by the sensitive appetite, which is guided by pleasure and pain in seeking good and fleeing evil, to abandon his reason, or 2) he may be blinded by

1932-), ed. E. Greenlaw, et al., I, 179-82. Percival did go further than others in pointing out that the allegory which Spenser is driving at is that the ways of error are confusing. *Ibid.*, I, 181.

² Thomas Rogers, *A Philosophicall Discourse, Entituled, The Anatomie of the Munde* (London, 1576), p. 4r.

³ *De Somniis*, 460 b.

these passions, so that his senses will not be able to distinguish the real from the apparent. The only place where a man led mainly by senses and delights could end is where Una and Redcrosse found themselves Error's Den. While the dragon with which Redcrosse fights, is, as Osgood pointed out, the representative of doctrinal error,⁴ it seems to me that the wood represents a more general error—that of a man allowing his pursuit of delight of the senses so to stir him that he cannot make correct perceptions and, hence, ends, in this case, at that doctrinal error. Padelford has noted that Redcrosse's later separation from Una results from his following of emotion rather than reason.⁵ The difference between Redcrosse's first and second temptation is one of degree, not of kind.

The tree passage, then, instead of being a mere poetic excrescence or a mere classic echo, can easily be interpreted as Spenser's attempt, by means of a trope, to indicate the allurements of the sense of sight. This interpretation does not say that previous explanations are not valid and to the point, rather, it illustrates, I believe, Spenser's dexterity in combining a multitude of classic influences with his ultimate artistic aim by means of a highly functional imagery — an imagery that might at first sight seem merely decorative.

ERNEST S. GOHN

The University of Chicago

JOHN HEYWOOD, CHAUCER, AND LYDGATE

John Heywood, though he derives much of his matter in *A mery Play betwene the pardoner and the frere, the curate and neybour Pratte* from Chaucer's *Pardoner's Prologue and Tale*, commits the curious displacement of having the quarrel occur between the Pardoner and the Friar, rather than, as in Chaucer, between the Friar and the Summoner or between the Pardoner and the Host. While we may attribute this either to faulty remembrance of the situation in Chaucer or to Heywood's artistic requirements, it is interesting, and I think significant, to note that John Lydgate made

⁴ C. G. Osgood, "Spenser and the Enchanted Glass," *The Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine*, xix (1930), p. 24.

⁵ F. M. Padelford, "The Spiritual Allegory of the *Faerie Queene*, Book I," *JEGP*, xxii (1923), p. 8.

precisely the same error in the prologue to his *Seige of Thebes*, when, in referring to *The Canterbury Tales*, he speaks of the Pardoner's "Tellyng a tale to angre with the frere"¹

It seems likely that Heywood's choice of protagonists for his interlude may have sprung either from a recent reading of, or a more thorough acquaintance with, Lydgate's poem, which was very popular for over a century following its composition (c 1420), as is evidenced by its survival in twenty-two manuscripts, appearing in three of these together with *The Canterbury Tales*, which it was intended to supplement² It was also printed by Wynken de Worde (c 1500)

RICHARD A LONG

Temple University

REVIEWS

Linguistics and Literary History Essays in Stylistics By LEO SPITZER Princeton Princeton University Press, 1948. Pp vi + 236.

Linguiste éminent et remarquable polyglotte, à qui la sémantique en particulier doit de récentes conquêtes, M Leo Spitzer confesse d'emblée une précoce déception d'étudiant. Dans sa Vienne natale, métropole raffinée et joyeuse où faisaient prime les troupes parisiennes de théâtre, il ne trouvait pas de vivante commune mesure entre les réalités impliquées par la littérature française et la "philologie romane" enseignée par ses maîtres (il a même à ce sujet des souvenirs dont l'humour est assez *burschikos*) Or il propose, après une carrière poursuivie des deux côtés de l'Océan, une "critique des beautés" textuelles qui permette au lecteur avisé d'aller profond dans l'intelligence des auteurs, sans recourir à d'obliques explications qui n'expliquent rien d'essentiel—l'essentiel étant, à n'en pas douter, l'individualité d'un écrivain telle que la peut révéler son style

S'agirait-il de revenir à ces commentaires laudatifs comme les a connus l'enseignement au temps des Merlet et des La Coulonche,

¹ *Seige of Thebes*, Part I, ed Axel Erdmann (Early English Text Society, London Oxford University Press, 1911), 1 35

² The relationships of these mss are traced in Part II of the Early English Text Society edition (London Oxford University Press, 1930), which was completed by Eilert Ekwell

conventions admiratives dont on savait gré à Brunetière et surtout à Lanson de débarrasser l'histoire littéraire? Si celle-ci, comme toute histoire, s'efforce de rechercher "ce qui s'est passé," elle ne saurait abdiquer un souci des enchaînements qui justifie même d'apparentes obliquités, mais, d'autre part, l'attachement au texte lui-même, le souci d'une appréciation qui convienne, comme disaient les logiciens, à tout le défini et rien qu'au défini, confèrent au plaidoyer de M. Spitzer un prix indiscutable. Le danger sera toujours—et lui-même n'est pas sûr d'y échapper—de systématiser à plaisir des mérites de style, donc d'individualité littéraire, qu'on peut rattacher à des "causes secondes". Gardons-nous de retomber dans les fioritures dont se gaussait à bon droit le fameux *Chef-d'œuvre d'un Inconnu* (La Haye, 1714), si digne de ses nombreuses rééditions...

Après un premier chapitre qui développe non sans hors-d'œuvre ce plaidoyer initial, quatre "essais," munis de notes abondantes et parfois évanescentes, vont opérer la démonstration elle-même. Il faut dire qu'on y accèderait plus docilement, si ces pages n'étaient pas déparées par des fautes d'impression, vénielles pour la plupart,¹ dont d'autres sont fâcheuses.² Et l'on ne voit pas bien³ pourquoi le *Timeo Danaos* de l'*Enéide* est mué en *Timeo Deos*, à moins que ce ne soit un jeu de mots destiné à renforcer une thèse implicite.

Il est bien intéressant de voir attribuer au "perspectivisme de *Don Quichotte*" un certain nombre de variations de vocabulaire et d'onomastique, réputées dès lors artistiques, magistrales et quasi divines,⁴ alors que Pierre Perrault, membre d'une famille fameuse, avait énuméré dans sa critique cartésienne⁵ du fameux roman les inconséquences et invraisemblances qu'il y trouvait, variété des noms comprise. Il n'est pas douteux que la gloire du livre a influé sur les critères d'une postérité favorable, l'ingénieux hidalgo avec son écuyer aura contribué à faire accepter comme une forme d'art ce qui avait pu sembler un hasardeux kaléidoscope.

Comme on regrettera, à propos du "récit de Thérémène," que M. Spitzer n'ait pas assisté à Orange, le 30 juillet 1938, à la représentation solennelle de *Phèdre* par la troupe du Théâtre Français! "Ce qu'on ne doit point voir, qu'un récit nous l'expose": ce morceau fameux était dit, selon une tradition ancienne et toute scénique, par un Thérémène d'abord surpris, puis horrifié, enfin atterré, et prenant une part personnelle à une catastrophe dont les "machines" de Quinault, sur le plateau de l'Opéra, auraient présenté gauchement le monstrueux agent.

¹ Lire, p. 11, 1901 pour *Bubu de Montparnasse*, p. 12, l. 4, les réveils, p. 94, tout entière, p. 98, sa dépouille, p. 119, j'ai cru, p. 141, suivies; p. 152, Palssot, p. 176, Volland, p. 177, l'inconséquence du jugement public, p. 183, Kohlhaas.

² P. 94, lire je hais jusqu'aux soins, p. 137, la Grande Revue du 25 novembre et non du 15, p. 194, l. 8 avant le bas de page, le laisser.

³ P. 92

⁴ P. 73

⁵ 1679

Nulle attention, comme de juste, ne sera faite ici de l'hellénisme de Racine, précoce et persistant, encore moins de ses maîtres en cette matière comme dans l'opposition au jésuitisme, les jansenistes de Port-Royal. Le mot "magique" ⁶ de *baroque* va suffire à tout, et nous savons en effet combien ce terme, fort justement appliqué par les historiens de l'art au goût religieux dominant en Autriche, en Pologne et surtout en Espagne, a été indiscrètement invoqué par une critique indifférente, dirait-on, à toute prière sur l'Acropole. Dès lors, cette tarte à la crème va déborder, non seulement sur le récit de Thérémène, mais sur une pièce tout entière, où de plus subtils investigateurs des énigmes raciniennes voient justement, même avant la désolante "cabale" que l'on sait, un gage donné par le converti de demain à "des personnes célèbres par leur piété et par leur doctrine." Rien qu'à relire la préface du poète, et surtout ses deux derniers paragraphes, on pénètre des intentions que seule une sorte de présomption pourrait faire négliger.

S'il est vrai que les liaisons authentiques seront toujours la grande affaire pour les historiens de tout genre, M. Spitzer s'est privé d'une sorte de transition bien tentante entre son troisième et son quatrième essai. Au collège Louis-le-Grand, nous le savons, le P. Porée démontrait à ses élèves—dont était Denis Diderot—que les "beautés" du récit de Thérémène étaient déplacées, et qu'un père anxieux devait couper court à ce développement pour en savoir la conclusion sans retard. En choisissant, dans la production si composite d'un grand prosateur, l'article *Jouissance* de l'*Encyclopédie*, notre philologue impénitent met bien le doigt sur une revendication tenace du philosophe en faveur de l'"action génitale, si naturelle, et si nécessaire et si juste" (*Jacques le Fataliste*). Surtout renforcé d'un passage de la *Religieuse* que même l'amî Nageon éliminait de l'œuvre à publier, ce commentaire fait ressortir, à l'insu du commentateur, l'illogisme d'un écrivain toujours hésitant entre Nature et Culture, entre Instinct et Société.

C'est si "la naissance du monde" et "l'ancre du sauvage adulte" comportent cette simple satisfaction de la nature, que remplacent des nuances plus complexes pour les civilisés, n'y a-t-il pas une choquante erreur de style à invoquer et à suggérer, pour ceux-ci, le même primitivisme que pour les êtres que découvrira le voyage de Bougainville? La spontanéité du prosateur et la docilité du commentateur ne devraient-elles pas s'adapter aux exigences de normes éloignées du *more ferarum* de Lucrèce? Et la haïssable "jouissance" d'une sadique telle que la Supérieure peut-elle, dans son exceptionnelle déviation due à une vie claustrale mal réglée, être invoquée à l'actif du style de ce brave Diderot, si normal et "petit peuple" dans sa psychologie et son idéal? Son "humanisme," mis en valeur par des critiques assez récents en France et en Russie, comporte un enthousiasme versatile pour diverses techniques

d'arts et de métiers où—il le sait et le démontre dans le *Neveu de Rameau* et dans le *Paradoxe*—ne peuvent exceller que ceux qui régissent cet enthousiasme même. Froidement, l' "homme de génie" travaille d'après la vaine mobilité extravagante des bohèmes trop spontanés.

Si la Grâce était impliquée mais secrète dans la pensée de l'auteur de *Phèdre*, elle est annoncée dès le titre dans la grande *Ode IV* de Paul Claudel qui fait l'objet du dernier essai *La Muse qui est la Grâce*. De fait, une étude de rythmique, analogue à celles qu'on a consacrées à la prose de Flaubert dans *Salammbô*, pourrait rapporter à une inspiration discontinue les scansions d'une poésie affranchie de la rime et du mètre, alléguant en revanche sa docilité à l'influx variable d'une inspiration quasi religieuse. On a pu comparer un tel style poétique aux irrégularités d'un jet d'eau, provenant d'un réservoir dont seraient variables les pressions. Des lignes brèves comme "Parole qui est à sa place intelligence et volonté" canalisent rationnellement, pour ainsi dire, ce qui ailleurs s'épanche en des versets surabondants—comme la Grâce M. Spitzer, qui⁷ semble aborder un tel problème, mais se sert de l'inopérante comparaison avec "une mer déchaînant ses vagues," est trop curieux de vocabulaire pour ne pas rechercher surtout les particularités verbales de cette composition, mélange de styles, préférence d'épithètes, énumérations chaotiques, mépris grammatical éventuel, donc reflets d'un trouble comme en 1907, et en Chine, pouvait le ressentir un catholique français incertain et déconcerté (mais alors pourquoi la Grâce, telle une Muse harmonieuse, n'agissait-elle pas?). S'il doit être admis, selon la doctrine préconisée par notre maître-linguiste, que toute œuvre d'art est une sphère parfaite dont n'importe quel point permet d'accéder au centre génétique de ce microcosme, on serait curieux de voir appliquer une incontestable ingéniosité à la fin du vers 10 de Claudel, " . il ne sert pas à rien, comme un fondateur de syndicats" Est-ce le conservatisme bourgeois du poète, ou la mansuétude de l'administration de l'époque, ou l'imprévision des syndicats chrétiens, qu'il convient de découvrir dans cette phrase?

Par bonheur, en dépit de toute réprobation systématique, notre éminent "linguiste" donne des gages à l'histoire littéraire et au "pluralisme" d'explications dont il lui semble qu'on devrait se passer. Rien que pour l'ode claudélienne, deux mentions⁸ de Walt Whitman nous rappellent combien des énumérations massives, révélées par les *Leaves of Grass*, furent un objet d'admiration ou de scandale pour le Parnasse français. A travers Lanson⁹ la fameuse excuse donnée par Diderot à ses "variations," les guioettes natales de Langres tournant à tous les vents et refusant de se fixer, nous ramène à l'un des plus anciens soucis explicatifs de l'Occident qu'une investigation plus poussée précise le traité d'Hippocrate

Des Airs, des Eaux et des Lieux, qui sait si l'humeur foncière de notre Langlois ne serait pas expliquée par cette "anémopsyché," s'opposant à une géopsyché de lamentable mémoire? C'est ainsi que la porte s'entrouvre, même dans la cellule magique où l'on entendait nous enclorre, vers ce "pluralisme" qui reste bien la ressource par excellence de l'histoire littéraire, de même qu'il constitue la dignité suprême des lettres elles-mêmes. Et notre Viennois ne redoutera point quelque *Anschluss* si c'est dans son texte allemand que je me permettrai pour conclure de citer la phrase de la lettre de Goethe à Zelter, 4 août 1803, où celui que Sainte-Beuve devait appeler "le plus grand des critiques" formulait un principe que, trente années d'après, il devait appliquer aux objets les plus variés.

Natur- und Kunstprodukte lernt man nicht kennen, wenn sie fertig sind man muss sie im Entstehen aufhaschen, um sie einigermassen zu begreifen

Il y a là un point de départ pour un branchement d'histoire littéraire qui ne réprouve nullement l'aide excellente offerte par la linguistique, mais qui s'autorise d'heureux exemples pour revendiquer son autonomie

FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

Paris

The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorum Edition The Minor Poems Volume Two Ed by CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD and HENRY GIBBONS LOTSPEICH, assisted by DOROTHY E MASON. Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947 Pp xi + 745. \$8 50

The appearance of another volume in the monumental Johns Hopkins Variorum Spenser is an important literary event and a cause for rejoicing. Since the appearance of the first volume in 1932, the plan, editorial policies, format, and arrangement in the edition have become familiar to students of Spenser and the period. What a reviewer likes or dislikes about this particular volume is to a considerable degree what he likes or dislikes about the whole edition. His expressions of approval are almost certain either to echo or to clash with the opinions of some past reviewer, and his strictures are apt to concern matters of policy which were determined before the first volume's appearance, and were not likely to be altered once that first volume had appeared. The present writer likes the impartiality with which the critical commentary is presented, and considers such impartiality implicit in the very idea of a "variorum" edition. In his liking for this policy he disagrees with at least one eminent reviewer of past volumes, W. L. Renwick. He does not, on the other hand, so heartily approve of some of the

methods adopted to save space, which force a reader to turn irritably from reference to cross-reference before finding the information he needs. Some of the cross-referencing is, of course, unavoidable, but to require a reader to refer again and again to the Bibliography in order to discover the date at which each quoted or summarized comment was made seems an unnecessarily extreme device for saving space—and saves only an infinitesimal amount of it, anyway. This disappointment in some details of the edition's general arrangement has been shared by more than one previous reviewer. But approval and disapproval of such editorial policies are alike ineffective now, except as expressions of opinion.

The editing of this second volume of the *Minor Poems*, by Professor Osgood and the late Professor Lotspeich, is highly judicious and skilful, as one would expect from scholars of their eminence and established reputation. The present reviewer cannot find—after a reasonably careful, though hardly exhaustive, check—that critical or scholarly commentary of any importance has been omitted. The editors have used both care and good judgment in choosing what to include, what to quote, and what to summarize. Their restraint in making their own comments is admirable, and these comments when they do occur are brief, intelligent, and nearly always clarifying. The study of the text itself (in Appendix X) is concise and thorough, extending to a listing of variants between corrected and uncorrected sheets found in different copies of the same edition. If future editors and scholars should disagree with the present editors' choice of words for their main text, they will have to recognize that the choice has been made with a full knowledge of the different possible readings.

Two general impressions from the collection of scholarly and critical comment in this volume (besides the inevitable one that a good deal of nonsense has been published about Spenser, as about all great writers) emerge vivid and somewhat distracting to an admirer of Spenser's art. The first is that the largest amount of scholarly discussion has centered on poems of lesser merit—such as *Mother Hubberds Tale*—rather than on supreme achievements like *Epithalamion* and *Prothalamion*. There are nearly sixty-four pages of notes and comment on *Mother Hubberds Tale*, as compared with fifty-four for *Amoretti*, forty-nine for *Epithalamion*, and only twenty-seven for *Prothalamion* (nearly eight pages less than for *The Ruines of Time*!), though *Prothalamion* is considered by many readers the loveliest of all Spenser's shorter poems. No criticism of the editors is intended—they simply reflected, as they were bound to, the actual state of published scholarship, and the phenomenon concerning *Mother Hubberds Tale* is, of course, partly explained by the fact that that poem is (probably) a concealed satire on contemporary events. But a student cannot help wondering whether such evidence does not in some measure justify the charge so fre-

quently made, that scholars love to labor on the non-essentials of literature

A second impression is closely related to the first, it is that surprisingly little really brilliant critical insight has up to the present become available in print to illuminate the *Epithalamion* and *Prothalamion*. The present writer remembers lectures by the late John Livingston Lowes that opened students' minds to the glories of these poems far more effectively than do any of the published comments included in the present volume. The warmth of Lowes' personality and the deep affection he inspired in his students doubtless accounts for some of the golden glow in these memories—but not for all of it. Something is lacking in the printed commentary that appears in this volume, so much of it either matter-of-fact and cold, or generalized and sentimental. Probably the explanation of all this is that the most illuminating published commentary on Spenser is either on the *Faerie Queene* or on his art in general, and thus does not find a place in the present volume. Nevertheless, the phenomenon confirms an opinion which the present writer has held for some time—that young scholars enthusiastic about *Epithalamion* and *Prothalamion*—or about *Amoretti*, for that matter—need not feel that here the flowers of criticism have already been plucked by others. The last word about these wonderful poems has not by any means yet been said.

GEORGE R. POTTER

University of California

Fearful Symmetry, A Study of William Blake By NORTHROP FRYE Princeton Princeton University Press, 1947 Pp 462 \$5.00

This is one of the major achievements of modern Blake scholarship. Mr. Frye has given us a most extensive, closely reasoned study of Blake's symbols and ideas and a detailed commentary of the prophetic books. He also has studied the relationship of Blake's ideas to the history of thought most carefully. Occasionally one feels that Mr. Frye has drawn out and restated Blake's ideas in modern terms which the text cannot always support. The phrase "Blake would probably have said" (104) is heard (though in the mind's ear) far too frequently. Blake emerges as a propounder of a subtle philosophy of identity, of metaphysical theories of time and cycles of culture which anticipate much in modern thought. His symbolism, based on an insight into universally diffused myths, appears as "archetypal" in a sense which we associate with the theories of Maude Bodkin and Wilson Knight.

Mr. Frye has much of interest to say incidentally e.g. on the biographical fallacy in criticism (326), on the false historicism

prevalent in literary scholarship (420) and on the peculiarity of the second half of the eighteenth century which he sets off sharply from the Augustan age. While one may sympathize with the general thesis, it seems paradoxical to say that "its chief philosopher is Berkeley and its chief prose writer Sterne" (167). The usual claimants, Dr. Johnson and Hume, are not even considered.

But Mr. Frye fails in the actual critical task of evaluation and even analysis of poetry as poetry: his reflections on metrics and genres seem to me mainly rhetorical (e.g. "the shimmering texture of evenly diffused sound" of Collin's *Ode to Evening*, 183). A comparison with Mark Schorer's *William Blake, the Politics of Vision* (Henry Holt, 1946) seems inevitable. Mr. Frye is far less in touch with modern poetic criticism and has much less to say about the poetry as poetry. In difference from Mr. Schorer he does not really attempt to persuade us of the poetic greatness of the prophetic books unless we accept simple declarations about the "finest unread poetry in the language" (220). Mr. Frye could, I presume, argue that his critical task is accomplished by the exposition of the profundity and modernity of Blake's myths and symbols. But one cannot help thinking that there is something wrong with the "mytho-poetic" conception of poetry here expounded. The prophetic books are a poetic desert and they cannot be defended as poetry by the finest exposition of the coherence of their symbolism and the value of their speculative implications. The whole relation between ideas and art must be misconceived by Mr. Frye as it was, no doubt, by Blake himself. Still, the book should be ranked with Foster Damon's and Milton Percival's as the ones which have penetrated farthest into the forest of Blake's symbols and has done most to vindicate the interest of Blake's speculations.

RENÉ WELLEK

Yale University

Keats and the Daemon King By WERNER W. BEYER. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. Pp. xii + 414. \$4.00.

William Sotheby's translation of Wieland's *Oberon*, this book contends, exerted a spell over Keats that "was never broken" (p. 277). Both Keats's "abiding philosophy of life" and the imagery and phraseology of "more than a score" of his poems derived from this Oberonic spell, particularly from Keats's "sympathetic understanding of the hermit [in *Oberon*], his eager assimilation of the saint's every word and thought . . ." (p. 283). Mr. Beyer regards *Oberon* as a poem of "pervasive idealism" rather than of "sex and sentiment" (p. 18), though many contemporary readers inclined to the latter opinion, and Wordsworth objected to a plot turning on "animal gratification."

To demonstrate his claims of Keats's indebtedness, Mr Beyer offers first a prose summary of Wieland's *Oberon*, then a series of "parallels" between Sotheby's translation and Keats's text. Why the prose summary is based on the German poem rather than on Sotheby's translation is hard to understand, Keats did not read German. The bulk of the book is devoted to the citation of parallels. Only one quotation of any length, however, is given from Sotheby's (comparatively inaccessible) translation, whereas the quotations from Keats are copious. This one quotation consists of four stanzas describing the mystic vision of a hermit (pp. 86-87). Actually this hermit, an aged widower carrying a rosary, plays but a brief and rather incidental role in *Oberon*. Yet his mystic vision, Mr. Beyer argues, caused Keats to "identify himself with Wieland's hermit" in "Sleep and Poetry," *Endymion*, *St. Agnes*, "Psyche," the "Grecian Urn," "La Belle Dame," *Lamia*, and *The Fall of Hyperion*. In fine, "Keats lived and thought and wrote in the shadow of eternity . . . the hermit became his central symbol" (p. 289).

How convincing are the cited parallels? Usually they consist of single words or brief phrases and seem far-fetched. As to the crucial mystic passage, the following specimens are typical (italics are Mr. Beyer's): (1) "*His spirit turn'd to that celestial shore*" (Sotheby), "and *my young spirit follow The morning sun-beams to the great Apollo*" (Keats); (2) "*he sees the form divine, The Uncreated in his creatures shine*" (Sotheby), "Sounds which will reach the Framer of all things" (Keats).

The least implausible parallels are found in some bits of Oriental imagery in *St. Agnes* ("barbarian hordes," "where swart Paynims pray," etc.), but Southey's or Byron's or Moore's Oriental poems could have been as influential in this as *Oberon*. The *cacoethes parallelum* raises a smile when it urges that Keats *disrobed* Madeline because Sotheby's heroine was *robed* (pp. 171-72), or that Porphyro embraced Madeline because a seductress in *Oberon* "suggestively opened her arms to the hero" (p. 179). Some interesting observations on the demonology of *Lamia* do not convince one that Keats was indebted more to *Oberon* than to Burton, for the context of the *Lamia* story in the *Anatomy* supplies a more satisfactory demonology.

With the possible exception of *St. Agnes*, the parallels cited in the present book cannot be called convincing. A list could be made, furthermore, of errors, inadvertences, and unfounded asseverations. There are sundry examples of circular reasoning, in which quotations from Keats are used to summarize Sotheby's text in order to prove Keats's indebtedness (pp. 109, 112, 113, 119, 136, 139, 146, 153, 169, 182). Finally, the Demon of this book is not *Oberon*, as the title suggests, but Wieland's widower-hermit. Witness his multiple avatars.

NEWELL F. FORD

Stanford University

The Poetry of Thomas Hardy By JAMES G. SOUTHWORTH New York Columbia University Press, 1947 \$3 00

While the value of Hardy's novels has been determined, that of his poems is still in question. Mr. Southworth leaves the poems almost where he found them. Proposing to survey them against the background of Hardy's thought, he separates matter from form. He examines the first of these in the first part of his book, the second in the second.

Hardy wrote about love, woman, mutability, life, death, and God. Surveying these matters in turn, Mr. Southworth proves Hardy a shrewd observer but an unsystematic philosopher. We learn that he "frequently speaks of worms in connection with the grave and death, but with no particular freshness" and that love is "a tricky business." These and other points are established in a kind of catalogue. "To understand the catalogue," says Mr. Southworth, "is better to understand [Hardy]." It is true that to understand his ideas is better to understand him, but to understand his ideas abstracted from the poems in which they appear is not better to understand his poems.

The same trouble occurs in the second part, where Mr. Southworth considers diction, metrics, and imagery. On the first of these he is most admirable. He fixes the proportion of archaisms, neologisms, dialect words, and those learned words of which Hardy, being self-taught, was inordinately fond. Noting manuscript revisions, Mr. Southworth shows that Hardy's choice of words was commonly determined by necessities of rhyme, alliteration, and meter. This would explain that unfortunate concolid of "flounder" with "around her" in "If It's Ever Spung Again." Out of tenderness perhaps Mr. Southworth avoids this example. But when he notices such infelicities, he takes them out of context. The point is not what words Hardy used but how they act in his poems. As Mr. Southworth justly remarks: "Judgments of isolated ideas or of uncorrelated phases of his technique, although valuable in themselves, are not enough."

Attempting more, he adds a chapter called "Architectonics" in which to consider poems instead of their parts. But he has little equipment for his undertaking. Although he refers frequently to "significant form" and quotes Roger Fry on the interior relations of parts, Mr. Southworth shows no inclination to apply his master. In analyzing a dozen of Hardy's better poems, he fails to show how meter, texture, imagery, and diction conspire. He fails to observe the function of parts or, in their context, their virtues or defects. In "The Fallow Deer," for example, he misses the triteness and awkwardness that injure Hardy's intention and he misses the beauty of the final lines. Not only Fry but Richards, Empson, and Brooks might have helped Mr. Southworth through these difficulties.

A final chapter determines Hardy's position, midway between those suggested by his idolators and his detractors. A victim of his age, Hardy is modern in ideas, Victorian in form. For this reason his poems as a whole are "unsatisfactory." Not that this minor poet altogether failed, he merely "failed to find a resting place on Parnassus." This judgment, somewhat impaired by qualification and metaphor, is not improper, and it might be convincing if more properly supported.

W Y TINDALL

Columbia University

On a Darkling Plain By HARVEY CURTIS WEBSTER Chicago
The University of Chicago Press, 1947 \$3 50

Mr Webster undertakes to show "the evolution of Hardy's thought and its effect upon his art." Although Mr Webster's treatment of the latter theme leaves something to be desired, his treatment of the former is excellent. His book, which augments and sometimes corrects the studies by Rutland, Chew, and Stevenson, is the best account of Hardy's "philosophy."

The incongruous elements that composed it had their origin, according to Mr Webster, in Hardy's hopeful disposition. Pious young Hardy (whose spiritual environment is traced through the pages of the *Dorset County Chronicle*) expected too much until at once darkened and enlightened by Darwin and the authors of *Essays and Reviews*. From these optimists came Hardy's gloomy preoccupation in novel and poem with accident, circumstance, and sexual selection. But the thought behind the novels and in them is so unsystematic and so various from novel to novel that Mr Webster wisely refuses to label it. Pessimism flourishes alongside meliorism, determinism alongside that inexplicable mystery which distinguishes Hardy from the naturalists. Much of this has been familiar to students of Hardy.

Of greater importance is Mr Webster's study of Hardy's social interests and of his consequent inconsistency. A cosmic pessimist, Hardy was a social meliorist, apparently unaware that if nature is determined, society must be determined. Mr Webster ingeniously suggests that the frustration by Meredith and Victorian society of Hardy's attempts at social protest (*The Poor Man and the Lady* and *The Hand of Ethelberta*) is responsible for the gloom of *The Return of the Native*, where despair of the remediable incongruously unites with despair of the irremediable.

Fifty-five years of fumbling resolved at last the cosmic and social contradictions in Hardy's thought. In *The Dynasts*, uniting the comprehensible with the incomprehensible, the pessimistic with

the melioristic in something like a system, Hardy became a philosophical artist. The novels, however good, suffer from philosophical inconsistency, for it is Mr Webster's contention that "if the philosophy of an artist is inconsistent, his work loses aesthetic value because of this inconsistency." Since the great thinker makes the great artist, Hardy at his most consistent is a "great philosophical poet." Neat, easy, and almost persuasive, this conclusion, failing to consider the nature of art, fails to explain why "Hap," philosophically consistent, is not a great poem or why most of the novels, however inconsistent, are more satisfactory than most of the poems.

Mr Webster's announced concern is with the "art and thought" of Thomas Hardy. That he is a kind of philosopher is abundantly proved. That he is a great artist, although a more questionable proposition, is taken for granted. However likely a relationship between his philosophy and the triumphs or failures of his art, nothing is established by asserting what must be demonstrated. But the avoidance of this critical difficulty does not detract from the scholarly values of Mr Webster's valuable book.

W Y TINDALL

Columbia University

Articles on American Literature Appearing in Current Periodicals, 1920-1945 Edited by LEWIS LEARY Durham, N. C. Duke University Press, 1947 Pp x + 337 \$3.00.

Mr Leary has here brought together, as he writes in his introduction, "articles on American literature appearing in periodicals from January 1, 1920, through December 31, 1945, as listed in (1) the check list printed in *American Literature* since November, 1929, (2) the annual bibliographies in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* since 1922 by Norman Foerster, Mr Paine, and Mr Johnson, and (3) Ernest E Leisy's bibliography in *The Reinterpretation of American Literature* (New York, 1928)." There are some minor qualifications to this statement of policy, but in the main it holds. Thus Mr Leary has been faced with the problem of reworking bibliographical checklists variously compiled, with bringing his definition of an "article on American literature" to bear on these lists, and with doing such checking as is editorially possible. Considering his intention and his handicaps, he has done a remarkably good job and has given us a first rate example of what he frankly admits is a compilation and a "preliminary survey."

There is little need to do more than glance at matters of plan and format. Readers of *American Literature* are familiar with the

arrangement by authors treated in a fourfold chronological grouping and by "miscellaneous" subjects treated in an omnium gatherum list. It is worth noting, however, that Mr. Leary has seen fit (and properly so) to omit the *American Literature* quarterly checklist notes on the contents of articles. Finally, there is a useful index of "Authors About Whom Articles Are Written" and in the table of contents a list of "miscellaneous" subject headings under which general articles are classified.

That this is a "preliminary survey" and that Mr. Leary has worked with handicaps is abundantly shown in the list itself, and it is needful here to comment on some shortcomings of the list and some confusion as to just what standards its compilers, present and past, have set for themselves.

1 *Accuracy of entries* A one-to-a-page sampling of some seventy-five entries (subject, let it be known, to all the dangers inherent in such a procedure) shows errors in fourteen. Only in one case, however, was the error so serious as to make finding the article listed virtually impossible. (The entry on p. 69 under "Holmes, Roditi" should be for the *Arizona Quarterly*, not *Accent*.) Some of the errors seem to be typographical, some to be the result of plain carelessness on the part of a contributor to one of the original lists. One wonders how rigorously these contributors checked on their own contributions and how carefully current contributions are being checked by the editor and whatever assistants he may have. In any case, there is certainly a need for those of us who use the list to take seriously Mr. Leary's request "to contribute to a revision of the list by informing the editor of each error or omission which comes to [our] attention."

2 *Coverage of periodicals surveyed* Working from sampled files of periodicals to the list itself, I have made the following tentative observations. All "articles on American literature" published in *American Literature*, *PMLA*, and the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* seem to have found their way into the list, about one-sixth of such articles published in *Modern Language Notes* do not appear in the list, about one-third of such articles published in the *Virginia Quarterly* do not appear, almost one-half of such articles published in the *Southern Review* do not appear, three-fifths of such articles published in *Accent* do not appear. It would seem, therefore, that the compilers have surveyed "scholarly" periodicals most carefully and have been less seriously concerned with "general" and "critical" periodicals. Since the great majority of these omissions cannot be justified by reference to Mr. Leary's loose definition of "an article on American literature" (p. vii), it would seem, from his sampling, that they result not so much from a conscious application of standards and definitions as from a lack of serious interest in such periodicals—The *Virginia*

Quarterly, the *Southern Review*, *Accent*, and the type they represent. Herein the list is simply not reliable.

What is needed in the promised revision of *Articles on American Literature*, then, is as much checking of entries as possible, and, more important, an attempt to work through and compile a list of articles from those periodicals which seem as yet to have been surveyed but half-heartedly. (I should think that Mr. Leary would welcome comments on just what periodicals do have thus to be resurveyed.) Meantime, it is to be hoped that we will be given something like a mimeographed list of corrections. And eventually we hope for a completely revised list. This one appears not to be exactly God's plenty, nor is it a joy forever. But it is a very good start indeed.

ROY HARVEY PEARCE

University of California, Berkeley

BRIEF MENTION

Macbeth By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. The New Shakespeare, edited by JOHN DOVER WILSON. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press and The Macmillan Company, 1947. Pp. lxxxiii + 186. \$2.50. The more than usually extensive introductory material in this latest of the New Cambridge series is characteristically full of useful information and stimulating, if not always wholly acceptable, suggestion. Despite the customary New Cambridge abundance of purely editorial stage directions, the text proper is very conservative. The Folio's misplacement of the "Lennox and another Lord" colloquy (III, vi) is adopted without even a comment. The Notes, as usual, are sprightly and illuminating.

CHARLTON HINMAN

Crabbed Age and Youth. The Old Men and Women in the Restoration Comedy of Manners. By ELIZABETH MIGNON. Durham, N. C. (Duke University Press), 1947. Front, pp. x + 194. \$2.50. A wholly revised and much abridged version of a Bryn Mawr doctoral dissertation, this book is a small but useful contribution to our knowledge of the fundamental constituents of the English comedy of manners of the Restoration. Dr. Mignon's introductory chapter at once makes clear her thesis that the unsympathetic treatment of old age is in these plays so extreme, so ubiquitous, and so

essential an aspect of real dramatic conflict as to represent a basic and distinguishing convention of Restoration comedy of manners. The succeeding chapters subject to more or less detailed scrutiny the dramatic treatment of old age in plays by Etherege, Wycherley, Dryden and Shadwell and Mrs Behn, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar, and thence is a short chapter, a "Postscript Concerning Sentimental Comedy." The rapid development, the flourishing, and the eventual desuetude of the convention discussed in the first chapter are thus briefly traced over a forty-year period. Perhaps, indeed, there has been rather too much abridgement. Few readers will be displeased because only characters in plays by the more prominent dramatists are considered in detail, but some readers may wish for more information as to how fully and with what differences, if any, the convention in question was exploited by the minor dramatists. And some readers will be surprised that Dr Mignon does not give considerably more attention than she does, even to the exclusion of other matter, to the study of the old in plays that are based upon earlier English or continental originals but have been adapted to the specifically Restoration mode. Yet perhaps she considers that her central argument does not require further evidence than she has adduced, and most readers will surely feel that she has made her case.

CHARLTON HINMAN

CORRESPONDENCE

GERNEMUDE AND THE BENIGHTED "GEOGRAPHY OF THE MINSTRELS" To my support of Madden's identification of Gernemuðe with Great Yarmouth¹ Professor Gladys Willcocks objects that, in spite of my "minimizing" of the difficulty, "Gernemuðe has to be not too far out of a course from Ireland to Brittany."² The objection seems reasonable enough in a timetable-conscious age of rapid communication and shortened distances,—when the pilgrimage to Canterbury, for instance, is made not in four days, but in two hours or less. But geographical haziness was of frequent occurrence in Lawman and other writers of six or eight centuries ago.³ Indeed, Lawman's "geographical blundering"⁴ is as noteworthy as his "sad ignorance

¹ *MLN* LX (1945), 41-42

² *YWES* for 1945, xxvi (1947), 63-64, cf also 31-32

³ Geographical vagueness is also one of the weaknesses that modern flesh is heir to. I recall in 1939 a motorbus driver in Monmouth who had equally hazy notions of the geography of Britain and Wales outside his own limited bailiwick. Cf also Madden's comment (*Brut*, III, 407) on the editor of Wace (*Le Roux de Lincye*, who identified "Guinant" [= Wissant, II, 221] with Winchester!) "This lamentable ignorance of English topography is shown, I regret to say, throughout the work."

⁴ See Madden, III, 425, note on lines 30543-47

and disregard of history and chronology" ⁵ It appears in passages of the *Brut* which concern places much nearer to "Ernleze on fest Radestone" than was Great Yarmouth or the Isle of Wight It appears when he writes of Dorset, ⁶ and of Wiltshire ⁷ Even Caerleon-on Usk in nearby Monmouthshire he surprises us by placing in Glamorgan! ⁸ But in dealing with places as far away as Yorkshire or Scotland ⁹—or the east coast of England ¹⁰—Lawman is as hopelessly confused as he is with the topography of France or Italy ¹¹

Such ignorance of geography (*pace* Miss Willcocks) is not unusual in contemporaries or near contemporaries who saw, presumably, more of the world than did the priest of Ernley Somewhat later than Lawman's *Brut*, the romance of *Sir Tristrem* (which is "not Northern, as has hitherto been claimed, but written in the dialect of London" ¹²) reveals the same extraordinary vagueness In his edition of *Sir Tristrem* Sir Walter Scott put his finger on this common medieval phenomenon in a note ¹³ which demonstrated the breadth of his reading "It is no objection that, in stanza 73, ¹⁴ seven days' voyage is said to bring Tristrem from England to Ermone [Caernarvon or in Scotland?] ¹⁵ for, in another place, ¹⁶ the hero takes nine

⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 345, note on line 11424, see further notes on 12149, 13097, *et passim*

⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 419, note on 29544 "In either case [whether we read "Dorchester" or "Rochester"], Lazamon has committed an error in writing *southward* instead of *westward*" (To Cernel = Cerne Abbas, 29674)

⁷ *Ibid.*, III, 357, note on 15190 "In either case [whether *Aelenge* (Elinge) alludes to Allington or Wilton] Lazamon is mistaken as to the site of Stonehenge" This *Aelenge* does not appear in Wace

⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 327, note on 6006 Caerleon is a considerable distance from the nearest point of Glamorganshire (*Glommargan*, 6047) It is today less than 75 miles from Arley to Caerleon

⁹ Cf Madden's notes on Conisburgh (11646), Dunian (18336 Wace's *Damen* 8451), and *bi Norðe* (24386)

¹⁰ Lawman apparently renders Wace's *un port en Kent* (6705, ed Arnold, SATF) into English as *inne pere Temese* (13789) Lawman's confusion (of Thanet?—see Arnold's introduction to Wace, I, xlvii, for the couplet pre-seized in MS J, which may conceivably have appeared in Lawman's source) with the Thames serves as further evidence of his ignorance of East Coast geography

¹¹ Lawman confuses Chimon with Caen (see Madden's note to 27910 25) in France, on Caen-Chimon see further R H Fletcher, *The Arthurian Material in the Chronicles* (Harvard Studies and Notes, 1906), pp 111 12, 122 23 As for Italy, cf "Salome" (which Lawman apparently manufactured out of Wace's *terre desaloe*, 2874'), note to *Brut* 5266

¹² Bertram Vogel, *JEGP* XL (1941), 538-44, especially p 543

¹³ On *Ermonie* Cf McNeill's ed (Scottish Texts Soc, 1886), p 99 "Scott suggested that [Ermonie] might be another name for Caernarvon, the land opposite to Mona But the geography of the old romances is not to be taken seriously, and the Ermonie of *Sir Tristrem* belongs to the same unmapped country as the maritime Bohemia of Shakespeare"

¹⁴ In McNeill's edition, line 800

¹⁵ See my note 4 in Sir Herbert Grierson's edition of the *Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, XII, 182, also Scott's earlier conjecture on p 180

¹⁶ In McNeill's edition, lines 1160-61

Nizen woukes and mare
He hobbled vp and doun

weeks to pass from Cornwall to Ireland. In truth, *nothing can be more vague* [my italics] than the geography of the minstrels, even when treating of their own country. In the French Fragment, Kahardine sails from London to Bretagne, by the way of Boudeaux and Ushant! ”¹⁷

Other instances of untenable topography, like Jehan de Wavrin's placing of Caeleon on the Thames¹⁸ or Sir Thomas Gray's coronation of King Arthur at Winchester,¹⁹ will occur to the reader

ROLAND M. SMITH

The University of Illinois

Scott's meaning for *hobled* (“tossed”) is to be preferred to McNeill's (“hobbled, fluctuated”), see *NED*, and cf Chaucer's *shoppes hoppers*, *Knt* 2017

¹⁷ Apparently one of Scott's lapses of memory is involved here, for Kahardin skirted not Bordeaux but Boulogne-sur-Mer. See *Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, ed. Bedier (*SATF*, 1902), I, 403, lines 2805-07, 2810

La terre estrange en costeiant,
Par devant le port de Witsant,
E par Buluingne e par Treisporz
Passent par devant Normendie

Here indeed is a sufficiently “coast-hugging course” to satisfy Miss Willcocks. Scott himself was guilty of “vague geography” when he confounded Wissant (near Calais) with Ushant (near Brest in Brittany).

Scott might have mentioned that the earlier journey of Kahardin to London (ed. Bedier, lines 2589-92) took twenty days and twenty nights, under full sail

Trenche la mer ove sa nef,
Vers Engleterre curt a tref
Vint jui3, vint nuz 1 a curu
Enz qu'il seit en l'isle venu

Cf. Bedier's note, I, 395

¹⁸ *Recueil*, ed. Hardy, *Rolls Ser.*, I, 377 “la cyte de Legionne laquelle est scituee sur la riviere de Thamise.” This aberration would seem even less excusable than Lawman's assumption almost three centuries earlier that Gernemuðe (= Great Yarmouth) lay *en route* between Ireland and Brittany

¹⁹ *Scalacronica*, ed. Stevenson, *Maitland Club* (1836), p. 260 (as recorded by Leland) “Arthure was crowned at Wynchestre.” Jehan de Wavrin, *op. cit.*, I, 353, departs from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *in civitatem silcestris* when he locates Arthur's coronation at Gloucester “en la cite de Clocestre Dubritius, l'arcevesque de Legionne couronnast le gentil jovenencal Artus”, cf. Hardy's note on p. 591

The anachronistic element in the chronicles is well known. As Fletcher, *op. cit.*, p. 216, observes with respect to the author of the “Large” *Brut*, many medieval writers “conceive English geography in the age of Brutus as identical with that of the time of Edward I or Edward III.”

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

FEBRUARY, 1949

Number 2

TWO NOTES ON J. T. WILLIAMS' "WORDS INTO IMAGES IN CHAUCER'S *HOUS OF FAME*"

In his recent article, "Words into Images in Chaucer's *Hous of Fame*,"¹ Mr. Jerry Turner Williams has presented an example from *The Zohar* of words turning into images in a manner strikingly parallel to the incident Chaucer described in the *Hous of Fame*.² As Mr. Williams himself noted, however,³ there is as yet no evidence that Chaucer had a first-hand acquaintance with this thirteenth century Hebrew work, or had even heard of it.

To establish a likelihood that any piece of writing may have given Chaucer the suggestion for his unique passage concerning the upward flight of words and their attaining human shape, it should be demonstrated that he knew the material well. The argument is made more conclusive still if it can be proved that he referred to it in another context.

It appears to me that there may exist such a source in Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, and that the context proving Chaucer's familiarity with it is in his own translation of that treatise. The lines I have in mind occur initially in Prosa One of Book Four:

And for thou hast seyn the foime of the verray blisfulnesse by me that have whilom yschewid it the, and thou hast knowen in whom blisfulnesse is yset, alle thingis ytreted that I trowe ben necessaie to putten forth, I schal schewe the the weye that schal bryngen the ayen into thyn hous, and I schal fyeche fetheris in thi thought, by whiche it mai arisen in heighe, so that, alle tribulacioun idon away, thou, by my gyding and by

¹ *MLN*, LXII, 488-490 (November, 1947)

² Chaucer's *Complete Works*, edited by F. N. Robinson (Cambridge, 1933), *Hous of Fame*, II, ll. 1070-1081.

³ Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 490.

my path and by my sledys, shalt mowen retourne hool and sounnd into
thi contree ⁴

This passage is amplified in the translation immediately following

I have, forthi, swifte fetteris that surmounten the heichte of the hevене
Whanne the swifte thoght hath clothid itself in tho fetteris, it despiseth
the hateful eithes, and surmounteth the rowndnesse of the gret ayi, and
it seth the clowdes byhynde his bak, and passeth the heichte of the regioun
of the fir, that eschaufeth by the swifte moevynge of the firmament, til that
he areyseth hym into the houses that beren the steires, and joyneth his
weies with the sonne, Phebus, and felawshipeth the weie of the olde colde
Saturnus, and he, imaked a knyght of the cleie sterre (*that is to seyn,*
whan the thought is makid Godis knyght by the sekyng of cleer trouthes
to comen to the verray knowleche of God)—and thilke soule renneth by
the cerle of the sterres in alle the places there as the schynynge nyght is
ypainted (*that is to sey, the nyght that is cloudeles, for on nyghtes that*
ben cloudelcs it semeth as the hevене were peynted with diverse ymages of
sterres) And whan the thought hath don there inogh, he schal foileten the
laste hevене, and he schal pressen and wenden on the bak of the swifte
firmament, and he schal be makid parfit of the worschipful lyght of
God ⁵

In the cases of both the *Hous of Fame* "speche" and the *Boece*
"thought" there is clearly a personification: the "speche" becomes
human, in the shape of its speaker, and the "thought" is "imaked
a knyght of the cleie sterre." That the speech of the *Hous of Fame*
assumed human semblance is indisputable. And, certainly, as
Chaucer words the passage from *Metrum* One, there can be no doubt
that the "swifte thoght" was also considered in terms of human
attributes. It "despiseth," it "seth," and it is "makid Godis
knyght." In the second quoted passage the third person singular
masculine pronoun is used six times to describe the stellified thought.

Moreover, the two contexts in which I see resemblances are con-
cerned with flight from the earth to a celestial dwelling place.

Despite these facts, the parallel is far from perfect. One obvious
difference is that the "speche" in *HF* takes the shape of its utterer,
while the "thought" in Boethius, though assuming a form of some
sort, and acting as if it were its originator, does not don a specifi-
cally designated shape.

Nonetheless, whatever differences exist do not seem too great to
preclude Chaucer's reworking of this image from Boethius into the

⁴ Chaucer, *op cit*, *Boece*, Prosa 1, Liber Quartus, ll. 66-78.

⁵ *Ibid*, *Metrum* 1, Liber Quartus, ll. 1-29.

form found in the *Hous of Fame*. As far as generally accepted chronology is concerned, there is no apparent gap between the times of composition of these works sufficiently great for it to be argued that Chaucer was either unacquainted with Boethius when he wrote the *Hous of Fame*, or could have forgotten the Latin treatise and his own translation of it at the time he composed the dream vision.

But, although the passage cited by Mr Williams may have had no direct influence upon Geoffrey Chaucer, there seems a possibility that it was known and utilized by another and later English poet, John Milton, who was thoroughly familiar with Hebrew. Milton's dependence upon *The Zohar* has been postulated previously, notably by Denis Saurat,⁶ so that the suggestion that there is a direct connection between the lines quoted by Mr Williams and work of Milton may not seem startling or far-fetched.

It will be recalled that in *The Zohar* the holy words ascend to heaven and are presented to God:

For the words of the holy Law spoken here below ascend on high, where multitudes come to meet them to take them up and present them before the Holy King, there to be adorned with many crowns woven of the supernal radiances . . . are arrayed before the Holy One, blessed be He, who delights himself with them.⁷

At the beginning of Book XI, *Paradise Lost*, the prayers of Adam and Eve ascend also:

To Heav'n thir prayers
Flew up, nor missd the way, by envious windes
Blow'n vagabond or frustrate in they passd
Dimentionless through Heav'nly dores, then clad
With incense, where the Golden Altar fum'd,
By their great Intercessor, came in sight
Before the Fathers Throne Them the glad Son
Presenting, thus to intercede began

See Father, what first fruits on earth are sprung
From thy implanted Grace in Man, these Sighs
And Prayers, which in this Golden Censer, mixt
With incense, I thy Priest before thee bring,
Fruits of more pleasing savour from thy seed
Sow'n with contrition in his heart, then those
Which his own hand manuring all the Trees
Of Paradise could have produc't, ere fall'n
From innocence.⁸

⁶ Denis Saurat, *Milton: Man and Thinker*, New York, 1925.

⁷ *The Zohar*, quoted by Williams, *op cit*, p. 489.

⁸ John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book XI, ll. 14-30.

Four parallels I consider noteworthy, in addition to the similar flights to heaven

(1) the adorning of the words—in *The Zohar* by "crowns woven of the supernal radiances," and in *Paradise Lost* by incense,

(2) the presentation before God—in *The Zohar* by "multitudes," and in *Paradise Lost* by the Son,

(3) the delight that God is said to take in these holy words,

(4) the religious (non-pagan) tone of both passages

As a Christian, Milton naturally would have substituted the Son for the "multitudes" of the Hebrew work. The replacement of crowns by incense seems merely a change of symbolism that maintains the same tenor of meaning.

The ceremonial nature of both rites seems to strengthen the possibility of a connection such as I propose.

Thus, while doubting any relationship between *The Zohar* lines and those in the *House of Fame*, and putting forward a conjectured source for the latter work in Boethius, through Chaucer's own translation, I feel that the passages cited by Mr. Williams may well have been used by Milton.

JULIAN ZIEGLER

Newark, N. J.

THE CLASSICAL LAMENTATIONS IN THE NUN'S PRIEST'S TALE

At the climax of the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, as dawn Russell the fox bears Chauntecleer "by the gargat" toward the woods, Chaucer interrupts his narrative with a satirical passage ridiculing the bombastic lament for King Richard I in Geoffrey of Vinsauf's treatise on poetry called the *Nova poetria*.¹ Chaucer then continues with the following description of the crying of Chauntecleer's wives, which, so far as I can tell, has not hitherto been discussed in connection with the *Nova poetria*.

¹ See *Canterbury Tales*, VII, 3338-3354 (B 4528 4544), *Nova poetria*, ll 368 430, pp 208-210 in E. Faral, *Les Arts poetiques du XIII^e et du XIV^e siecle* (Paris, 1924). These passages and others are treated by Karl Young, "Chaucer and Geoffrey of Vinsauf," *Modern Philology*, xli (1944), 172-182, while a convenient bibliography is offered in his notes on p. 172.

Certes, swich cry ne lamentacion,
 Was nevere of ladyes maad whan Yhon
 Was wonne, and Pirrus with his streite sweid,
 Whan he hadde hent kyng Priam by the beid,
 And slayn hym, as seith us *Eneydos*,
 As maden alle the hennes in the clos,
 Whan they had seyn of Chauntecleer the sighte
 But sovereynly dame Pertelote shrighite,
 Ful louder than dide Hasdrubales wyf,
 Whan that hir housbonde hadde lost his lyf,
 And that the Romyngs hadde brend Cartage
 She was so ful of torment and of rage
 That wilfully into the fyr she sterte,
 And brende hirselven with a stedefast heite
 O woful hennes, right so criden ye,
 As, whan that Nero brende the citee
 Of Rome, cryden senatoures wyves
 For that hir husbondes losten alle hir lyves,
 Withouten gilt this Nero hath hem slayn ²

Chaucer himself indicates that the *Aeneid* tells of the fall of Troy, the commentators have pointed out that the story of Hasdrubal's wife is recounted in one of Chaucer's favorite books, the *Epistola adversus Iovinianum* of St Jerome, and Chaucer's fuller knowledge of Nero is attested in his own *Monk's Tale*. Despite this apparent adequacy of "sources" for the classical shrieks and lamentations to which the cries of the old widow's hens are compared, I could not escape the thought, on rereading this passage, that surely somewhere in the 2116 lines of the *Nova poetria*, Geoffrey of Vinsauf must have mentioned the fall of Troy. The search was brief: five lines before the passage Chaucer has just ridiculed, the following words occur:

Minos subvertit Athenas,
 Ylion Atrides, magnae Cartaginis aices
 Scipio, sed Romam multi ³

These lines must have lain almost directly beneath Chaucer's eye as he completed the passage ridiculing Vinsauf's lament for Richard

² See *Canterbury Tales*, VII, 3355-3373 (B 4545-4563), I use F. N. Robinson (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, etc. [1933]).

³ See *Nova poetria*, ll. 361-363, p. 208 in Faral. The actual cries of the hens were probably suggested to Chaucer by his main source, see for example the words "Pinte schrei" in line 135 of *Reinhart Fuchs* as presented by J. R. Hulbert in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (ed. W. F. Bryan and G. Dempster, Chicago [1941]), p. 661.

The comments on Ylon, Cartage, and Rome, must have suggested to Chaucer that he could elaborate on the cries of Chauntecleer's wives by learnedly alluding to the lamentations of wives bereaved when each of these ancient cities was destroyed. The conclusion seems to me inescapable, that in both the classical matter and the turgid manner of his amplification of the barnyard wailing, Chaucer still had the *Nova poetria* in mind, his ridicule of Vinsauf, accordingly, is even more extensive than has been supposed.

ROBERT ARMSTRONG PRATT

Queens College

CHAUNTECLEER AND PARTLET IDENTIFIED

In an allegorical interpretation of "The Nun's Priest's Tale," Professor J. L. Hotson says, "I have yet to see or hear of a rooster who combines a black bill, white claws, and azure legs with a gold plumage."¹ Then he proceeds to show that Chauntecleer's colors represent the arms of Henry of Bolingbroke. His theory may be right, if it is, it gives further evidence of Chaucer's artistry in adapting knowledge from all sources to his creative needs.

Nevertheless, such a rooster does exist today and has existed in England for an unknown period before the eighteenth century. There is every reason to believe that the breed was known in Chaucer's time, most European breeds were known as early as the twelfth century. Since the eighteenth century, the name Hamburg has been assigned to all varieties of Chauntecleer's breed. As Chaucer describes him,

His coomb was redder than the fyn coral,
And batailled as it were a castel wal,
His byle was blak, and as the jeet it shoon,
Lyk asure were his legges and his toon,
His nayles whitter than the lylle flour,
And lyk the burned gold was his colour

NPT 4049

Since the usual color of a rooster's comb is red, even "coral" red, there is no need for further comment on the first line. "Batailled" gives the first clue to Chauntecleer's identity. Robinson

¹ "Colfox vs Chauntecleer," *PMLA*, (1924), p. 774

glosses the word as "battlemented, notched with indentations."² This particular notching is not the serrated notching of a single comb, but the crenelated notching of a rose comb, which is typical of all varieties of Hamburgs

The bill requires a little more explanation. Chaucer says it "was blak" and "as the jeet it shoon." *The American Standard of Perfection* describes it as "dark horn."³ "Blak" and "dark" are obviously synonymous, and the "jeet" clause is by no means inappropriate. Although jet is usually thought of as pure black, in one form it is a variety of brown coal, which may be black or brownish-black. There are two possibilities: (1) the rooster Chaucer describes actually had a black shiny bill, and the dark horn of the modern Hamburg is the result of breeding, or (2) Chaucer used "blak" in the general sense of dark or brownish-black, which appears black against a crimson background (Chauntecleer's face is crimson).

Blue legs and toes are characteristic of all six varieties of Hamburgs, but I can find no reference to nails in any description of any breed of poultry except in Chaucer. Actually, the color of nails varies, I have seen white, yellow, and black nails. Apparently this detail no longer seems important to poultry fanciers and is consequently omitted from their descriptions.

Chauntecleer's "burned gold" plumage gives the clue to the specific variety to which he belongs. Only two varieties of Hamburgs are of English origin: the Silver Spangled and the Golden Spangled. Chauntecleer is a Golden Spangled Hamburg—a progenitor of the better-known Brown Leghorn.

"Have ye no mannes herte, and han a berd?" has nothing to do with identifying Chauntecleer's breed, but it seems important in attempting to establish a real rooster as the source for Chaucer's description: it is humor *plus* realism. The truth is that domestic fowls do have tufts of feathers at the throat (sometimes extending to the ears) commonly called beards.⁴ The remarkable thing about

² F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1938), p. 1057.

³ *The American Standard of Perfection*, printed and published by The American Poultry Association, Inc. (Buffalo, N. Y., 1940), p. 310.

⁴ John H. Robinson, *Principles and Practice of Poultry Culture* (New York, 1912), Glossary, s. v. "beard."

the beard is not that Chauntecleer had one, but that Chaucer was so adept in using that seemingly unimportant piece of information

This gentil cok hadde in his governaunce
 Sevene hennes for to doone al his plesaunce,
 Whiche were his susties and his paramours,
 And wonder lyk to hym, as of colours,
 Of whiche the faireste hewed on hir throte
 Was cleped faire damoysele Pertelote
 Curteys she was, discreet, and debonaire,
 And compaignable, and bar hyrself so faire,
 Syn thilke day that she was seven nyght oold,
 That trewely she hath the herte in hoold
 Of Chauntecleer, loken in every lith

NPT 4055

Darwin tells us that "in the spangled Hamburgs, there is a considerable degree of similarity between the sexes," and "in the golden-spangled Hamburgs the hen is equally beautiful with the cock . . ."⁵ This corresponds to Chaucer's "wonder lyk to hym, as of colours" and the "beautee" of Partlet's face.⁶

Any female capable of bearing "hyrself so faire" at the early age of seven nights that she could capture Chauntecleer's heart, would have to belong to one of the egg breeds, for the heavier breeds do not produce feathers nor lose their awkwardness until much later. But in the small breeds like the Hamburg, the largest wing feathers may have started to grow before hatching, and a pullet may have enough wing and tail feathers by the end of the first week to look like a miniature hen. Besides this, a feathered, week-old pullet is as graceful in her movements as a mature hen.

Partlet's beauty is further enhanced by the "scarlet reed" about her eyes. No mention is made of the color of Chauntecleer's face, but since his sister and paramour is "wonder lyk to hym, as of colours," we can justifiably apply the "scarlet reed" to his face also.

In conclusion I submit the following comparative outline as evidence that Chaucer's actual source for his cock and hen was the breed of chickens known today as Golden Spangled Hamburgs. The description of the Golden Spangled Hamburg has been ab-

⁵ Charles Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication* (New York, 1900), I, 261 ff.

⁶ NPT 4350

stracted from *The American Standard of Perfection* and from my own observations.

<i>Chaucer</i>		<i>The Golden Spangled Hamburg</i>	
Comb	color — coral red type — "batailled"	Comb	color — bright red type — rose
Face	scarlet red	Face	bright red
Bill	"blak" as jet it shone	Bill	dark horn
Legs and Toes	azure	Legs and Toes	lead blue
Nails	white	Nails	not described
Color	burned gold	Color	(a) neck — golden bay with lustrous greenish-black stripes down middle of each feather (b) body and breast — clear golden bay
Females	(a) colored like cock (b) graceful at seven days (c) fan hued on neck (d) beautiful	Females	(a) colored like cock (b) feathered and graceful at seven days (c) neck feathers end with an elongated small black spangle with touches of green (d) as beautiful as cock

LALIA PHIPPS BOONE

University of Oklahoma

FURTHER SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY CHAUCER ALLUSIONS

The publication of elaborate studies dealing with the later reputations of some of our older authors often has done much to substantiate or correct some widely held views about such writers as Shakespeare, Jonson, Spenser, Milton, et al. At the same time such works, by references to authors other than those immediately under discussion, frequently accomplish the purely secondary purpose of recording allusions to other writers which serve to supplement the already recorded citations of such individuals. A case in point is G. E. Bentley's *Shakespeare & Jonson: Their Reputations in the Seventeenth Century Compared*.¹ This admirable collection serves to call attention to the following items, which deserve wider attention than they are likely to receive in Professor Bentley's volumes

¹ Two volumes, Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1945.

They are reproduced here precisely as found therein, the editorial data of course being omitted

1 J M, ca 1615²
 Surrey & Sidney, honor of or age
 were both of them of noble parentage
 yet not then honor makes them live so longe
 as doth their poems & learned pleasinge songe
 before their time Sr Jeffr'y Chaucer he
 the first life giver to or poesie

2. E G, 1646³
 To the Author
 If ever I beleiv'd *Pythagoras*,
 (My dearest friend) even now it was,
 While the grosse Bodies of the *Poets* die,
 Their Soule doe onely shift And *Poesie*
 Transmigrates, not by chance, or lucke, for so
 Great *Virgils* soule into a *goose* might go
 But that is still the labour of *Joves* blame,
 And he divinely doth convey that veine
 So *Chaucers* learned soule in *Spencer* sung,
 (*Edmund* the quaintest of the Fairy throng)

3 Peter Heylyn, 1652⁴
 And finally for Poetrie, 1 *Gower*, 2 *Lidgate*, a Monk of *Burie*, 3 the
 famous *Geofrie Chawcer*, Brother in Law to *Iohn* of *Gaunt* the great Duke
 of *Lancaster*, of which last Sir *Philip Sidney* used to say, that he marvelled
 how in those mistie times he could see so cleerly, and others in so cleer
 times go so blindly after him

4 William Winstanley, 1687⁵
 [Drayton] was buried in *Westminster-Abbey*, near the South-door, by
 those two eminent Poets, *Geoffry Chaucer* and *Edmund Spencer*, with this
 Epitaph made (as it is said) by Mr *Benjamin Johnson*

Louisiana State University

THOMAS A. KIRBY

² Bentley, *op cit*, II, 27

³ *Ibid*, p 69, reprinted with slight variations on pp 278-79 This item is
 recorded by Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and*
Allusion, 1357-1900 (Cambridge, 1925), I, 224-25, who omits "for so" in
 line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, and 8, which considerably enrich the context

⁴ Bentley, *op cit*, p 84

⁵ *Ibid*, p 192 Spurgeon (*op cit*, I, 261) cites but does not quote this
 passage.

THE PEARL'S AUTHOR AS HERBALIST

The gromwell now appears to have been chosen by the author of the *Pearl*¹ for its pertinence to the title of the ancient poetic fantasy. This singular pertinence reveals anew the unidentified author's detailed knowledge of herbs. It tends to show that the mystical and devout hand which first traced out the *Pearl* in beautiful angular letters was that of a monastic apothecary, a theory earlier advanced by Sister Madeleva.

I became curious as to the possibility of an inner meaning for the word gromwell soon after a copy of the Belles Lettres edition of the *Pearl*² was put into my hands by Dr. Anders Orbeck while I was enthusiastically auditing at his generous invitation his class in Middle English. Because of the position of the word gromlyoun in the text, at the end of a line, as if the author wished to emphasize it, I suspected a hidden motive.

I met the gromwell, of course, in line 43, in the following passage:

On huyle þer peile hit tiendeled doun
Schadowed þis worteȝ ful schyre & schene—
Gilofre, gyngure, & gromlyoun,
& pyonys powdered ay bytwene

The passage presents the floral mosaic at the scene of the author's vision of the beautiful immaculate woman beyond the stream dividing life and death.

I was piqued by Osgood's glossary, which defined gromlyoun as the noun gromwell, and referred me to the Old French gremillon, diminutive of gromil.

Exceeding the traditional boundaries of scholarship in the humanities, I went to Baillon's *Dictionnaire de Botanique*³ in the library of Michigan State College. On page 746 in Volume 2 of Baillon, I found gromwell defined as the *nom Anglais des Grémils* (*Lithospermum L.*)⁴. The Graeco-Latin designation meaning stone-seed led me to a second, even more specific Graeco-Latin designation,

¹ Unique manuscript Cotton Nero A. x. + 4, British Museum.

² *The Pearl*, edited, with introduction, notes, and glossary by Charles G. Osgood, Jr.

³ *Dictionnaire de Botanique* par M. H. Baillon, Librairie Hachette & Cie, Paris, 1886.

⁴ The gromwell is a lithontriptique (Baillon), touted in bygone years as a remedy for "the stone."

Maigarospermum, which suggested to me the etymological clue (L *margarospermum*, G₁ *marganitās*, Skr *manjarī*, in the sense *pearl, flower*) to the reasoning followed in all probability by the author of the *Pearl* before listing the gromwell in the position of climactic emphasis

The cross-reference to grémils in Baillon (Vol 2, page 740) uncovered a singularly pertinent description "The most important of these species is the Grémil officinal (1 e used by the apothecary), better known under the name of *herbe aux perles à cause de la surface lisse, brillante et gris de perle de ses achaines*" Baillon's description of the seeds of the gromwell points out the element of pertinence

On this point, through the kindness of Henry L. Savage, archivist of the library of Princeton University, I am able to cite photostat notes of Mrs. Allen Maiquand of Princeton, describing the seeds of the gromwell as "white, smooth, and shining," and reporting the gromwell to be common in England. I acknowledge with gratitude Mrs. Maiquand's kind permission to see her brief notes on the peony and gillyflower also. Mrs. Marquand is inclined to agree with Sister Madeleva in her theory on the author.

Whether the author of the *Pearl* were a Canon Regular of the Order of St. Augustine, a distinct possibility,—a grey or white friar—and it has been asserted that Huchown of the Aule Reale was a Dominican—we may now one day know, especially if the quest be carried on through such records as are available in the infirmaries of the last thirty years of the fourteenth century.

It has been "nice knowing" Hugo of the Royal Hall and Ralph Strode, the philosopher, but only if we can place one of them, at least for a time, in the pharmacy or the herbarium can we continue to think of him as the possible author of the *Pearl*. How pleasant it would be to many of us to discover one day that the *Pearl* came from the hand of one of the Brothers of the Common Life,—some brave, enlightened, clear-thinking visionary like Gerard Groote!

The symbolism of the pearl, incidentally, is alive today in liturgical writings, and therefore is no great mystery, the pearl means sanctifying grace, the possession of which is essential to the enjoyment of the Kingdom of Heaven.

The elegy-content seems to me a minor threnody, the main purport of the poem is sibylline didacticism.

EDWIN WINTERMUTE

Michigan State College

THE CHRONOLOGY OF *SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT*

The artistry of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* has never been questioned. The admirable sense of architectonics, the skillful interweaving of the two motifs, the poetic treatment of the passing of the seasons, and the adroit variations in describing the three-day hunt and test—all have been praised. But there is another way in which the *Pearl* poet has proved his ability to handle technical problems: the manner in which he treats chronology in one part. The passage with which I am concerned is the last five stanzas of Fitt II (lines 995-1125) and the first few lines of Fitt III, which describe the Christmas festivities at the Green Knight's castle, the agreement for the "game" between Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, and the departure of the guests.

The problem confronting the poet was simply that he had one more day than he needed. He wanted a Christmas festival lasting three days and a series of hunts and tests lasting another three days, but there are seven days between Christmas and New Year's. His solution, familiar to students of the drama, was ingenious: he telescoped the third and fourth days. Unless Gollancz' theory¹ that a line has been omitted by the scribe, a line that would refer to Childermas day activity, be accepted—and its acceptance would, I believe, destroy the tone of the passage—or unless we grant that the poet was unaware of this technical problem, telescoping is the only logical answer.

All the evidence of the poem points to the fact that the poet was not only aware of the problem, but shrewdly selected and placed his details so that the missing day would not be noticed by the casual listener or reader. There is first a full stanza describing the merriment of Christmas day, but the intervening part of the festival until the evening of December 27 is passed over quickly.

Much dut wat3 þer dryuen þat day and þat oþer,
 And þe byd as þro þronge in þerafter,
 þe ioye of sayn Jone3 day wat3 gentyle to here,
 And wat3 þe last of þe layk, leude3 þer þo3ten (lines 1020-3)

¹ See I. Gollancz, ed., *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Oxford, 1940), note to lines 1020-3.

If, as Gollancz suggests, a line be inserted between 1022 and 1023, such as "With most myȝe and mynstiaȝe Childermas sued," the specific reference to St John's day loses all its effectiveness and the poet seems merely intent on keeping his chronology straight. Furthermore, since in lines 1021-2 the artist has already given the impression of two distinct days (the second line is actually a kind of appositive to the first) and since that impression will be reinforced in the following passage, no insertion seems necessary.

The careful reader will note that all the action from line 1024 to the end of Fitt II and of the opening lines of Fitt III takes place on the evening of St John's day and the following morning a final celebration for the guests which lasted until "hit watȝ late," a tête-à-tête between Sir Gawain and the Green Knight in the host's chambers which resolves into another entertainment when the host "let þe ladies be fette to lyke hem þe better," and the departure of the guests early the next morning. But the poet has emphasized the idea of lateness in lines 1025 and 1027, he devotes almost a hundred lines to the final scene in Fitt II, he allows Sir Gawain to refer to the "bot bare þe dayeȝ" which remain for him to find the Green Chapel, and he gives the reader a definite impression that the second entertainment continues for a long time during which the lords and ladies (presumably members of the household) "dronken and daylyeden and dalter vntyȝtel, / quyle þat hem lyked." By now the reader has unconsciously accepted the impressionistic technique and is prepared to recognize lines 1126-7,

Ful erly bfore þe day þe folk vprysen,
Gestes þat go wolde hor gromeȝ þay calden,"

as the equivalent of December 29. Thus, though the last four stanzas of this second part (excluding line 1020) all take place on December 27, the poet has so skillfully managed the allusions to dates and time that an extra day has seemed to pass and the three days of the hunt seem to bring the poem to New Year's day.

MELVIN R. WATSON

Louisiana State University

A SOURCE FOR THE PASSAGE ON THE ORIGIN OF
CHESS IN LYDGATE'S *TROY BOOK*

In Book II of the *Troy Book*, written between 1412 and 1420, Lydgate states that chess was one of the various games played in the new Troy being built by Priam. He discusses it at some length and sets forth two conflicting ideas as to its origin, one from Guido de Columnis whose *Historia destructionis Troiae* written about 1287 he is translating, and the other ostensibly from Jacque de Vitry, historian of the crusades and writer of martyrologies, who flourished about 1240

And it was first found in þis cite,
During þe sege, liche as seyth Guydo
But Iacobus de Vitriaco
Is contrary of oppynioun
For, like as he makyth mencoun,
And affermeth fully in his avys,
How Philomete, a philosophre wys,
Un-to a kyng to stynte his cruelte,
Fond first this pleie & made it in Calde,
And into Grece from þence it was sent ¹

Dr Bergen, editor of the *Troy Book*, makes no comment on these lines in his fourth volume of notes,² nor has anybody else attempted to explain precisely where they have come from.

Scholars who have searched unsuccessfully through the works of Jacque de Vitry for the inspiration for this passage may find it in the well-known book on chess by Jacobus de Cessolis, *De ludo scaccorum*, written about 1280 and translated and published by Caxton in 1474. De Cessolis states that chess was invented by a Chaldean philosopher named Philometer in order to teach the cruel king, Euilmoradag of Babylon, self-restraint and good manners. That it could have been invented during the time of the Trojan war as some, most notably Guido de Columnis,³ believed, De Cessolis flatly rejects.

¹ *Lydgate's Troy Book*, ed Henry Bergen *E E T S*, xcvi (London, 1907), Part I, pp 167-68

² See Part IV, *E E T S*, cxxvi (London, 1935), 215 ff

³ *Historia*, ed Nathaniel Edward Griffin (Cambridge, Mass, 1936), 49
Huus autem civitatis diversorum ludorum diversa genera diversis in ea adinventionibus statuerunt. In ipsa primo adinventa fuerunt scaccorum solatia curiosa ibi ludi subito irascibiles alearum, his repentina dampna et lucra momentanea taxillorum

Opinantur iamque alii hunc ludum inventum fuisse tempore belli Troiani
sed hoc non habet veritatem Nam a Caldeis ad Grecos transiit ut dicit
Grecus Dyomedes qui inter philosophos primam famam accepit apud Grecos

Huius ludi ac novitatis inventor extit philosophus quidam orientalis
Xeises apud Caldeos vel Philometer apud Grecos qui idem est apud Latinos
mensurae sive iusticie amator ⁴

Thomas Hoccleve, writing his *The Regement of Princes* in 1411-12, about the same time as Lydgate wrote the *Troy Book*, also makes use of *De ludo scaccorum*, referring to it as "the Chesse moralized," but he correctly assigns authorship to Iacob de Cessolis ⁵

Whether Lydgate's error resulted from his own carelessness, defective memory, or desire to mislead, or whether it was copied from some other work, it reveals clearly that the Medieval writer felt no compunction about being inaccurate in acknowledging his sources to him and his readers one learned name served as well as another

W. F. MARQUARDT

Evanston, Ill

'OUT BORN' IN *LUDUS COVENTRIAE*

In the trial scene before Pilate in *Ludus Coventriae* (play 30), Pilate has this to say to Caiaphas and Annas

Serys of o thyng than gyf me relacyon
if jhesus were out born in þe lond of galelye
ffor we han no poer ne no iurediccyon
of no man of þat contre
Ther fore þe trewth 3e telle me
And A nother wey I xal provyde
if jhesus were born in þat countre
þe jugement of herowdys he must A-byde ¹

To this Caiaphas replies "in galelye I know þat he was born" (l 335), adding (ll 337-39)

⁴ *De ludo scaccorum* [Utrecht, c 1475], "Capitulum primum" and "Capitulum secundum" I have standardized the spelling and expanded the abbreviations in the text

⁵ *Hoccleve's Works*, ed Frederick J Furnival, *EE T S*, Extra Series, LXXII (London, 1897), 77

¹ K S Block, *Ludus Coventriae* (London, 1922, *EETS*, ES, 120), p 282 f, ll 325-32 I have not indicated the expansion of abbreviations

for he was born in bedlem jude
 and þis 3e knowe now All and haue don here ²
 þat it stant in þe lond of galelye

Block, in her edition of the *Ludus Coventriae*, does not gloss *out born*, but *NED*, following the reading of the Shakespeare Society edition of 1841, has *outborn*, taking it as the first recorded instance of an obsolete adjective and substantive *outborn*, 'born out of the country, of foreign birth, a foreigner' And Adams³ compromises by printing *out-born* and leaving the word unexplained

If we accept the *NED* interpretation, we are up against a syntactical difficulty how are we to construe the phrase *in þe lond of galelye*? Should it be considered an apposition to the adjective (or substantive) *outborn*? In that case, why do we find the preposition *in* and not *from*? For certainly Jesus was no foreigner in Galilee The play here follows the biblical text closely Luke xxiii, 6-7 reads "When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man were a Galilean And as soon as he knew that he belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod, who himself was at Jerusalem at that time" Needless to say, Jesus is nowhere referred to as a foreigner or of foreign birth, and *out born* can, therefore, hardly have such a meaning, either

The fact is that *out* in *out born* is not the modern word 'out' but merely a variant spelling of *ought* or *aught*, meaning 'at all' *Aught*, spelt *howth*, is used in the same pleonastic fashion in play 28 (l 985)⁴ where Jesus asks the crowd that had come to seize him "Is howth þour comyng hedyr for me" In the dialect of the *Ludus Coventriae* the consonantal group *ght*, frequently written *th*, had obviously been reduced to simple *t*, for we find there not only the form *methowut* (play 29 l 82) but also such inverted spellings

² Failing to understand this line, J O Halliwell (Shakespeare Society ed, 1841), followed by J Q Adams (*Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas* [Boston, 1924], p 184), put a comma after *knowe* and emended *and* to *I*, thus "And this ye know, now alle I have don here" This does not make sense at all, whereas the original version is perfectly clear, even if the periphrastic use of the past participle *don* may be somewhat unusual, at least in southern texts (for its occurrence e g in Middle Scots see G Gregory Smith, *Specimens of Middle Scots* [Edinburgh, 1902], p xliii, §5), the meaning of *and haue don here* is simply "and have heard" This instance of the periphrastic perfect considerably antedates those given in *NED* (*do*, 31)

³ *Op cit*, p 184 (l 256)

⁴ Adams, *op cit*, p 176 (l 94)

as *owth* for *out* (28 933), *abowth* for *about* (29, stage direction after l 69), and *rowth* for *rout* (30 75) ⁵ The above line 326 consequently means "If Jesus were perchance born in the land of Galilee"

HELGE KOKERITZ

Yale University

ALLITERATION AS A MEANS OF STANZA CONNECTION IN *THE FAERIE QUEENE*

Various critics have commented upon Spenser's use of alliteration,¹ and his employment of a number of devices of stanza connection has been studied,² but it seems that Spenser's consistent use of alliteration as a stanza-linking device, though it has not escaped observation,³ has provoked almost no study, despite Tucker Brooke's note that "there are at least four devices, all deserving further study, by which Spenser solders together his stanza and minimizes the jar occasioned by the final alexandrine"⁴

⁵ The corresponding pages and lines in Adams are 179 13, 175 41, 179 (stage direction preceding l 1), 179 6

¹ An early study is Virginia E. Spencer's dissertation, *Alliteration in Spenser's Poetry*, Zurich, 1898, her rather scanty observation of alliterative stanza linking is quoted below (note 3)

Lilian Winstanley, in her introduction to Book II of the *FQ*, Cambridge, 1919, treats briefly the 'mediaeval ornament of alliteration,' stating that the 'subtle variety and beauty of Spenserian alliteration' is much more probably derived from Irish metre than from Anglo-Saxon. She notes that 'in Irish metres alliteration is employed initially as a regular system, but, besides that, there are a number of subordinate alliterations employed irregularly and frequently, many of them occur medially and the alliterations and assonances are run on from line to line and stanza to stanza'

(Cf. E. de Selincourt's Introduction to the Oxford Spenser [*O S A*], lxxi-lxvi)

² Chiefly by Tucker Brooke, in 'Stanza-Connection in the *Fairy Queen*,' *MLN*, xxxvii (1922), 223-7. (Cf. *The Works of Edmund Spenser*, A Variorum Edition, Baltimore, 1932 and ff., *passim*—especially note to *FQ*, vi, vii, 26 9 27 1 [Vol. vi, 219].) Also Arnold Stein's extension of Brooke's article, 'Stanza Continuity in *The Faerie Queene*,' *MLN*, lxx (1944), 114-8

³ Spencer, *op cit*, Part II, p. 13. "The alliteration is often carried over from one stanza to another thus forming a connecting link, this is frequently done by repetition." Stein, *op cit*, cites only ii, ix, 13 and 15

⁴ *Loc cit*, p. 224. Brooke, however, mentions (among the four) only rhyme and not alliteration

Spenser's use of alliteration for stanza connection is an extremely sensitive and flexible technique, it may serve to simplify by putting some examples recorded in a recent reading into three groups *regular*, *subordinate*, and *complex* (this for purposes of listing, description, and discussion only)

I call *regular*, or primary, that which is more conventional in its alliteration, having prominent alliteration of initial consonants in the alexandrine of one stanza repeated by alliteration of the same sounds as initial consonants in the first line of the following stanza. *FQ*, I, vii, 15 9-16 1 will serve as an example

15 9—And in a *Dongeon deepe* him threw without remorse
16 1—From that *day* forth *Duessa* was his *deare*

The alliteration is frequently anticipated before the alexandrine or carried beyond the following first line—sometimes both, as in III, vii, 31-32

31 8— did fall
From her in flight, he found, that did him sore apall
32 1—Full of sad feare, and doubtfull agony,
Fiercely he flew upon that wicked feend

The following are further examples of this kind

I, viii, 40 9 41 1, I, xi, 23 9 24 1, 2, I, xi, 44 9 45 1, II, xi, 35 9-36 1, III, vii, 31 8 32 1, 2, IV, xii, 9 9 10 1, V, I, 17 9-18 1, V, I, 24 9-25 1, V, vi, 25 8, 9 26 1, 2, VI, iii, 48 9 49 1, VI, v, 18 8, 9-19 1, 2, VI, vi, 10 9 11 1, 2, VI, vii, 33 9 34 1, VI, viii, 33 9 34 1, VI, x, 43 9 44 1, VI, xi, 30 9 31 1, 2, VI, xii, 36 9 37 1, VI, xii, 37 9 38 1, VII, vi, 8 8, 9 9 1, VII, vi, 11 9 12 1, VII, vi, 48 9-49 1

I call *subordinate*, or secondary, that which is medial or final alliteration—either in the alexandrine or following first line—and initial alliteration in the other. As example, VII, vii, 29-30, where the alliteration of *l* is initial in 29 9, and final and medial in 30 1, there is much anticipation and echoing in both stanzas 29 and 30

29 9—And now would bathe his limbes, with labor heated sore
30 1—Then came the Autumne all in yellow clad

Similarly in VI, vii, 44 9-45 1 (where there is also anticipation and echoing). Occasionally there is regular reinforced by subordinate, as in V, I, 24 9-25 1

24 9—Did cast about by sleight the truth thereout to straine
25 1—And sayd, Now sure this doubtful causes right

And II, vii, 57 9-58 1, 2

57 9—That *drenched* lay full *deepe*, under the Garden *side*
 58 1—*Deepe* was he *drenched* to the upmost *chin*,
 Yet *gaped* still as *coueting* to *drinke*

Complex aliterative stanza-linking I would classify as follows

a) Double In III, ii, 39-40, where there is initial, medial, and final alliteration of *d* and *m*

39 9—Till *death* make one *end* of my *dayes* and *miserie*
 40 1—*Daughter* (*said* she) what need ye be *dismayd*,
 Or why make ye such *Monstei* of your *mind*?

Similarly I, viii, 39 9-40 1 [*b* & *f*], VII, vi, 15 9-16 1 [*f*, *s*].

b) More than double In III, Proem, iv-v [*s*, *l*, *m*, *d*]

iv 9—*My* senses *lulled* are in *slomber* of *delight*
 v 1—But let that *same* *delitious* Poet *lend*
 A *little* leave unto a *rusticke* *Muse*

Other examples of this type I, xi, ii 9-12 1, III, viii, 41 9-42 1, 2, VI, i, 31 9-32 1, VI, iv, 1 8, 9-2 1, VII, vi, 43 9-44 1, 2 [*s*, plus change from *b* to *p*, back to *b*]

This technique of alliteration is often used with the other devices of stanza connection noted by Brooke *With Relative*, II, viii, 32-3, *with Conjunction*, VI, iii, 48-9, *with Rime Linking*, II, xi, 38-9, *with Repetition*, II, vii, 57-8 (quoted above), [see also I, xi, 11-12 (cited by Brooke)], *with Verbal Echo*, III, viii, 41-2, [cf also VI, xii, 36-37]

This does not pretend to be a complete counting and classification of Spenser's uses of alliteration in stanza-linking but rather, it is hoped, a further note to Tucker Brooke's article, with sufficient examples⁵ to prove that Spenser's use of alliteration for this purpose was frequent, studied and skillfully varied⁶ There remains for fur-

⁵ I have omitted about six references where the alliteration may be accidental, or the result of another intention (such as repetition)

⁶ Brooke, *op cit*, 225, believes that it is most likely Spenser got from Virgil his first hint for this useful means of combining stanzas Miss Winstanley, in the Introduction cited above, has suggested an Irish influence for his rich alliteration and assonance, but it is also possible that Spenser in his Middle English reading was struck by the stanza linking in certain of the rimed romances—cf Margaret P. Medary, 'Stanza-Linking in Middle

ther study the larger problem of Spenser's employment of this and other stanza-linking devices to develop themes and ideas over the space of a number of stanzas as 'a kind of sweet undertone' it is still one of the secrets of his melody

R J SCHOECK

Princeton, N J

ON THE CLOSING LINES OF *THE FAERIE QUEENE*

The concluding lines of *The Faerie Queene* read in the *textus receptus*

But thence forth all shall rest eternally
With Him that is the God of Sabaoth high
O' that great Sabaoth God, grant me that Sabaoths sight

Ever since the time of Upton, editors have regularly emended the phrases to read "God of Sabaoth," "Sabaoth God," and "Sabbath sight," for Upton pointed out that "Sabaoth" means "hosts" whereas "Sabbath" means "rest," and, reminding his readers of the usage in Romans 9 29, suggested that there was a verbal confusion in the printing of the lines. When Ralph Church adopted Upton's suggestion, he added the weight of James 5 4 to his interpretation. Now this may be the proper reading, for it has a certain harmony with the hopeful despair of the concluding stanzas, nevertheless, if the 1609 edition was carefully printed from Spenser's holograph or an exact apograph and Spenser knew what he was saying, it is possible to see an equally brilliant artistic meaning in the unemended lines.

One should first remember that the Biblical quotations mentioned by Upton and Church are peculiar to the A V, hence Spenser must have found "sabaoth" in the Vulgate where it is a careful transliteration of σαβαωθ. Erasmus, commenting on the passage in Romans, notices that the Greek is a phonetic rendering of צבאות and that, though it is never rendered by the LXX or Aquila in this fashion, yet "Paul must have seen some mystery in it to transliterate it into Greek." The mystery, if there is one, is that the

English Verse,' *Romantic Review*, vii (1916), 243-70, and Arthur C L Brown, 'On the Origin of Stanza Linking in English Alliterative Verse,' *ibid.*, 271-83

word is one of the frequent modifiers of God in the O T The Psalms and the Prophetic Books are filled with צבאי יהוה and יהוה צבאות in various forms, a formula usually rendered as "Lord of Hosts" But what did the צבאות, the "sabaoth," mean in Spenser's time? The usual gloss on this word is that of Drusius (1582) on the passage in Romans Sunt autem exercitus alii coelestes, & alii terrestres coelestes sunt, ut verbi gratia, Sol, Luna, Stellae, item Angeli & Meteorae terrestres, qui terra manique continentur, & in aere volant This remains the standard comment on the word even in Milton's day

If Spenser was aware of this bit of theological erudition and wrote the two words with a discrimination in mind, his closing lines could mean All shall eventually obtain permanent repose with him who is the God of quiet, but until then, O God of the Great Sabbath (the envisioned day of Eternal quiet) grant that I may see, when I have left this world and come to dwell in the shelter of Your constancy, the great panorama of the Creation as You see it from Your immovable center In other words, Spenser's conclusion may be a prayer for redemption and for admission to the ranks of the Saints and not for a state of actionlessness The word *sight* may be the key, for it is more poetically applicable to a God's-eye-vision of the great swirl of Creation than to a condition of immobility But this is only a conjecture about what may be but a typesetter's whim

DON CAMERON ALLEN

A NOTE ON *THE TAMING OF THE SHREW*

Recent scholarship, while accepting the theory that *The Taming of a Shrew* is a bad quarto, tends to regard it as a corrupt rendering, not of the folio text of *The Taming of the Shrew*, but of an earlier version of the play, which has not otherwise survived¹ A comparison of the principal clowns in the two plays adds further support to this view

¹ Raymond A Houk, "The Evolution of *The Taming of the Shrew*," *PMLA*, LVII (1942), 1009-38, G I Duthie, "The Taming of a Shrew and *The Taming of the Shrew*," *RES*, XIX (1943), 337-56

It is generally recognized that Sander in *A Shrew* and Grumio in *The Shrew* are essentially the same character: they perform the same dramatic function and in several scenes they speak almost identical lines. However, it has not yet been pointed out that they differ in certain important details of characterization and stage-business.

Grumio is an unusually short person. He refers to himself as a "a little pot," declares that "considering the weather a taller man than I will take cold," and is addressed by Curtis as a "three-inch fool."² Sander, on the other hand, is a person of at least average stature, whose height is contrasted with the shortness of Polidor's boy. He refers to the boy as "plaine friend hop of my thum,"³ a joke which would have no point if there were not an obvious difference in size between the two. Even more conclusive is the later scene of horseplay in which the boy threatens to cut off Sander's leg with his sword.⁴ The humor of this, again, almost certainly depended upon the fact that the boy barely came up to Sander's waist.

Moreover, in this scene between Sander and Polidor's boy, we have a commonplace of the Elizabethan comedy of the late 1580's and early 1590's: the wit-combat between tall clown and diminutive page.⁵ This kind of scene is conspicuously absent from *The Shrew*.⁶ Biondello, who corresponds in that play to Polidor's boy, never engages in any kind of conversation with Grumio, though they are on the stage together in several scenes.⁷ It seems likely either that the folio text of *The Shrew* dates from a time when railing scenes between clown and page had grown temporarily stale and out-of-date, or that it was written for a different group of actors from that which had performed *A Shrew*.

² *The Taming of the Shrew*, IV, 1, 5-6, 9-10, 25. I use the line numbering of the Oxford text.

³ *The Taming of a Shrew*, ed. F. S. Boas (London, 1908), I, 1, 225.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 11, 32-53.

⁵ See, for example, Sir Thopas and Epiton in Lyly's *Endimion* and Armado and Moth in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

⁶ Raymond A. Houk, in "Shakespeare's *Shrew* and Greene's *Orlando*," *PMLA*, LXII (1947), 657, n. 6, seems to think there is a possibility that II, 11, 153 of *A Shrew* may not have been in the original play from which *A Shrew* was derived. In this article, Mr. Houk puts forward the theory that *The Shrew* and *A Shrew* derive independently from a preliminary sketch by Shakespeare.

⁷ I, 11, III, 11, V, 11.

It is easy to believe that an actor or reporter, reconstructing the text of a play from memory or incomplete notes, could garble lines and confuse scenes, but it is rather more difficult to assume that he could forget the physical characteristics of the principal clown in the piece, or the low-comedy business. The differences between Sandei and Giumio, therefore, while not conclusive evidence in themselves for an earlier version of *The Taming of the Shrew*, lend confirmation to other arguments which have already been put forward.

SIDNEY THOMAS

Queens College

WARLIKE FLUTES GELLIUS, CASTIGLIONE,
MONTAIGNE, AND MILTON

In a passage of the *Attic Nights* (1, 11) Aulus Gellius resumed and elaborated upon the considerable body of classical comment¹ on Spartan flutes in battle and thus, as a popular authority for such curiosities, probably transmitted the comment to the Renaissance. He wrote in part:

Thucydides, the most authoritative of Greek historians, tells us that the Lacedæmonians, greatest of warriors, made use in battle, *not of signals by horns or trumpets*, but of music by pipes, certainly not in conformity with any religious usage or from any ceremonial reason, nor yet that their courage might be roused and stimulated, which is the purpose of the horns and trumpets, but on the contrary that they might be calmer and in better order, because *the effect of the flute player's notes is to restrain impetuosity*. So firmly were they convinced that in meeting the enemy and beginning battle nothing contributed more to *valour and confidence* than to be *soothed by gentler sounds* and keep their feelings under control. Accordingly, when the army was drawn up, and began to advance in battle array against the foe, pipers stationed in the ranks began to play. Thereupon, by this *quiet, pleasant, and even solemn* prelude the fierce impetuosity of the soldiers was checked.

¹ In Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* II 31M), Athenæus (632F), Valerius Maximus (II 6 2), Cicero (*Tusc. Quest.* II 16), and elsewhere. Requiring no discussion here are Plato (*Rep.* III 399 and *Laches* 188D) and Aristotle (*Pol.* VIII 7 7 8 and VIII 6 4-6) with their *loci* for the Dorian mode as inspiration of courage, since both writers rejected the flute as an enervating extravagance.

Having come near Milton's addition of the Dorian mode, Gellius stopped to write down, *verbatim* and entire, the part of Thucydides (v, 70) cited by editors of *Paradise Lost*,² and so made plain his own elaborations—his contrast between flutes and trumpets, and ethical suggestions. For the early Greek (who would not have found them unusually soft), the flutes had been simply a rhythmic device to move troops in orderly formation. The Roman took a similar fact from another historian.

Tradition has it that the Cretans also commonly entered battle with the lyre playing before them, and regulating their steps. Furthermore, Alyattes, king of the land of Lydia, as Herodotus tells us in his *History* [1 17], had in his army and his battle-array orchestras of pipe- and lyre-players. What then is the meaning of that soul-stirring *shout* of the Roman soldiers?³

Castiglione seems to have alluded either to this *résumé* or to its sources. "It is read that the Lacedemonians, which were valiant in arms, and the Cretenses used harpes, and other soft instruments."⁴ But pretty clearly from Gellius are these words of Montaigne:

The Lacedemonian valour had neede of moderation, and of sweet and pleasing sounds of Flutes, to flatter and allay it in time of warre, least it should runne headlong into rashnesse and fury whereas all other nations use commonly piercing sounds and strong shouts, which violently excite and enflame their souldiers courage.⁵

Among the ancients Plutarch, who wrote four such references,⁶ was, so far as I am aware, the only one besides Gellius to add anything significant about a rational mean in valor, but in no phraseology

² For example, A. W. Verity, ed., *Milton, Paradise Lost* (Cambridge, 1929), II, 391.

³ Tr. J. C. Rolfe, Loeb Classics (New York, 1927), I, 53-55. See Polybius, *Hist.* IV 20 4-21 10.

⁴ *Courtier*, Bk. I, tr. Hoby, Everyman's Library (London, [1928]), p. 76.

⁵ *Essays*, III, 3, tr. Florio, Everyman's Library (London, [1928]), III, 41. My italics.

⁶ (1) *Moralia*, "Customs of the Spartans," 238 B-C, and (2) "Control of Anger," 458 E (x), (3) *Lives*, "Lycurgus," XXI 3, and (4) XXII 2-3. Jacob Zeitlin (tr., *The Essays of Michel de Montaigne* [New York, 1936], III, 30-31 and note, p. 336) has followed Jean Plattard in offering the second of these passages as his note on Montaigne, quoted here. Fred L. Jones ("Paradise Lost, I, 549-62," *Modern Language Notes*, XLIX (1934), 44-45) has proposed the fourth passage in elucidation of Milton.

did he come closer to Montaigne and Milton than did Gellius. He passed over the importance of the flute as such: the soldiers sang a hymn to its accompaniment, and their singing was evidence of courage, not a cause of it. Least of all did Plutarch consider Spartan courage an effect of soft rather than loud instruments, but the Roman Gellius and Renaissance writers could so speculate. Milton's infernal powers march

In perfect *Phalanx* to the *Dorian* mood
Of Flutes and soft recorders, such as Iais'd
To highth of noblest temper Hero's old
Arming to Battel, and in stead of rage
Deliberate valour breath'd, firm and unmov'd⁷

And within a few lines the instruments are again "soft pipes." Clearly, by repeating the adjective and by introducing the modern recorder, the poet meant, like Gellius and like the other two moderns, to insist upon the moral suasion not of music only, but of soft music.

HOWARD SCHULTZ

University of New Hampshire

A NOTE ON ASTRONOMY IN TENNYSON'S *THE PRINCESS*

The Princess Ida remarks, at the beginning of Canto IV of Tennyson's *The Princess*,

'There sinks the nebulous star we call the sun,
If that hypothesis of theirs be sound'

In his edition of *The Princess*, 1885, and later in his edition of *The Poetic and Dramatic Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson*, W. J. Rolfe makes the following note upon this passage:

Dawson says¹ 'The Princess, with the accuracy taught only recently by the spectroscope, calls the sun a *nebulous star*,' but the expression implies no more than was taught by the nebular hypothesis of Laplace, to which reference has been made by Psyche above. This is the 'hypothesis' of the next line.²

⁷ *Paradise Lost*, I, 550-554

¹ See Samuel E. Dawson, *A Study, with Critical and Explanatory Notes of Alfred Tennyson's Poem, The Princess* (Montreal, 1882), p. 55.

² *The Princess*, ed. Rolfe (Boston, 1885), p. 166; *Works*, ed. Rolfe (Boston, 1898), p. 817.

The "reference made by Psyche," which Rolfe cites, is obviously a reference to the Laplacean cosmogony

'This world was once a fluid haze of light,
Till toward the centre set the stairry tides,
And eddied into suns, that wheeling cast
The planets,

This passage earlier in the poem, in addition to the occurrence of the word *nebulous* in the first line of Canto IV, followed by *hypothesis* in the next line, led Rolfe to conclude that the Princess Ida was also referring to the "nebular hypothesis." The numerous editors since Rolfe, who have commented on the passage, have also assumed that Ida's speech is a reference to Laplace.³

Rolfe's interpretation has the support of Sir Joseph Norman Lockyer, the famous astronomer, who was intimately acquainted both with Tennyson⁴ and his poetry. In his *Tennyson as a Student and Poet of Nature* (London, 1910) Lockyer includes a section entitled "The Evolution of Stellar Systems," in which he quotes,

'There sinks the nebulous star we call the sun,
If that hypothesis of theirs be sound,'

with the explanatory comment, "Our sun is a remnant, has been 'shaped' out of a nebula."⁵

There is, nevertheless, no indication in the lines that Tennyson was thinking of the evolution of the sun or the formation of the solar system. He was thinking, rather, of the physical constitution of the sun at the time he was writing. Tennyson's own note on "the nebulous star we call the sun," prepared for Hallam Tennyson's edition of his father's *Works*, 1892, is simply that, "Norman Lockyer says that this is a true description of the sun."⁶ Whenever Tennyson prepared a re-issue of his poems he was anxious that any references to scientific matters be true to scientific knowledge at the time of the re-issue.⁷ His note in this instance indicates

³ E.g., Henry W. Boynton, Katherine Lee Bates, Charles W. Kent, H. W. Shyrock, George W. Woodbury, Wilson Ferrand, James Chalmers, Albert S. Cook.

⁴ See *Tennyson and His Friends*, ed. Hallam Tennyson (London, 1912), pp. 285-291.

⁵ P. 16.

⁶ *Works*, ed. Hallam Tennyson (London, 1892), p. 915.

⁷ E.g., see comparison of early and late versions of certain stanzas of *The Palace of Art* in *Works*, ed. Rolfe, p. 804.

that when, about 1891,⁸ he was making notes for his son's edition of the *Works*, he asked his friend Lockyer, one of the foremost solar astronomers of the day,⁹ whether *nebulous* was considered a fitting description of the sun *at that time*, and Lockyer replied, as any astronomer would have after 1868,¹⁰ that the description was a "true" one

Tennyson himself carefully read Samuel E. Dawson's study of *The Princess*, and in November, 1882, the poet wrote his Canadian critic a long letter of comment,¹¹ in which he particularly commended Dawson's "explanatory notes."¹² That Tennyson, always concerned about his scientific allusions, did not challenge Dawson's note on Canto IV, line 1, might be regarded as sufficient proof that Dawson was right, and that subsequent editors have been wrong.

Tennyson left no note on "that hypothesis of theirs," nor does Dawson try to identify it. That the poet was questioning the validity of the nebular hypothesis of Laplace in the 1840's, when he wrote the line, is hardly possible. Laplace first stated his theory of the origin of the solar system in his *Exposition du système du monde*, 1796, and made his final restatement of it in the posthumous edition of 1836. The theory was not effectively challenged until the late 1870's and the 1880's,¹³ and probably was never in better repute among astronomers than in 1847, when *The Princess* appeared.

Acceptance of the Laplacean cosmogony did not necessitate believing that the mass of the sun had continued in a nebulous or gaseous state. During the first half of the nineteenth century the concept of the sun developed by Sir William Herschel was generally accepted. Herschel had thought of the sun as an enormous cool, dark body, much like the earth, and richly stored with inhabitants. This inner sphere, Herschel believed, was protected from the

⁸ *Works*, ed. Hallam Tennyson, p. xi, Hallam Tennyson, *A Memoir* (London, 1897), II, 383.

⁹ Lockyer was author of *The Meteoric Hypothesis* (London, 1890), and numerous papers on solar physics and chemistry.

¹⁰ In that year spectroscopic analysis of sunlight proved the gaseous condition of the sun. See Hector Macpherson, *A Century's Progress in Astronomy* (London, 1906), pp. 51-52.

¹¹ *Memoir*, I, 256-259.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 256.

¹³ See John Ellard Gore, *The Visible Universe* (London, 1892), pp. 3-40.

terrific heat of the sun's upper luminous atmosphere by heavy canopies of clouds¹⁴

In stating that Tennyson has Princess Ida speak of the sun "with the accuracy taught only recently by the spectroscope," Dawson implies that the poet was clairvoyantly twenty-one years ahead of his time. As a matter of fact, observations of the total eclipse of the sun, visible in northern Italy and central Europe on the morning of July 8, 1842, gave rise to speculations about the interior of the sun which caused the later revelations of spectroscopy to come not entirely as a surprise.¹⁵ This eclipse was observed by more able scientists and given more collaborative study than had been accorded any previous solar eclipse in history. Among the more famous observers were G. B. Airy, the Astronomer Royal of England, and Francis Baily, the vice-president of the Royal Astronomical Society. Both these astronomers wrote graphic accounts of the eclipse,¹⁶ which commanded wide attention. That knowledge of the eclipse and speculation about the phenomena observed were not confined to professional circles is indicated by three articles in *The Athenaeum*, in July, August, and September, 1842, in which were reported the observations of Baily and Airy,¹⁷ and also those of Karl Littrow of Vienna¹⁸ and Francis Arago of France.¹⁹ The phenomenon which most interested all observers is thus described by Baily:

At the moment when the total obscuration commenced, a brilliant crown of glory encircled the moon. Suddenly from the border of the black and labouring moon thus singularly enshined burst forth at three distinct points within the aureola, purple or lilac flames visible to every eye.²⁰

The height of the flames was variously estimated at from two to six minutes of arc.²¹ Speculations about their nature and cause

¹⁴ *The Scientific Papers of Sir William Herschel* (London, 1912), II, 479-484.

¹⁵ See Frank Dyson and R. v. d. R. Wooley, *Eclipses of the Sun and Moon* (Oxford, 1937), pp. 51-53, also R. A. Proctor, *The Sun* (London, 1871), pp. 246-279.

¹⁶ Francis Baily, "Some Remarks on the Total Eclipse of the Sun on July 8, 1842," and G. B. Airy, "Observations of the Total Eclipse of 1842," *Memoirs of the Royal Astronomical Society*, xv (1846), 1-8, 9-18.

¹⁷ *The Athenaeum* (July 23, 1842), p. 658.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* (August 13, 1842), pp. 731-732.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* (September 3, 1842), p. 789.

²⁰ *Ibid.* (July 23, 1842), p. 658.

²¹ *Ibid.* (Sept. 3, 1842), p. 789.

varied, but most observers believed that the red prominences belonged to the sun rather than to the moon,²² and that they indicated the intense heat of a molten or gaseous mass well within the interior of the solar mass.²³ Sir William Herschel's notion of a cool, dark sun, protected by dark clouds from an envelop of fiery vapor could no longer stand unmodified. Sir John F. W. Herschel, whose *Outlines of Astronomy* was the most popular handbook of the subject for a quarter of a century, retained his father's notion of an opaque core in the sun, but as a result of observations of the eclipse of 1842, he considers the outer, nebulous "atmosphere" of the sun to be vaster than formerly supposed.²⁴ The English astronomers appear to have accepted Sir John Herschel's views, but Francis Arago, the most influential French astronomer of the 1840's, saw no evidence of a cold, dark core, and insisted that "the sun is a globe of luminous matter, covered with a luminous coating of considerable thickness, the luminous coating being matter in a gaseous state."²⁵

Thus, when Tennyson wrote *The Princess* the soundness of the nebular hypothesis was not generally doubted, the physical composition of the sun was a much discussed and debated topic. Apparently no reputable astronomer was willing to say that the sun was an entirely nebulous mass, yet most discussions of the sun called attention to the existence of a vast nebulous outer atmosphere. Tennyson would have been indeed rash, in 1847, had he not inserted at the suggestion of his friend George Stovin Venables²⁶ the cautionary line, "If that hypothesis of theirs be sound."²⁷

E. A. MOONEY, JR.

University of Maryland

²² Positive proof that the red projections belonged to the sun was made available through photography in 1860. See Mabel Loomis Todd, *Total Eclipses of the Sun* (Boston, 1900), pp. 34-37.

²³ R. A. Proctor, *The Sun* (London, 1871), pp. 246-268.

²⁴ Sir John F. W. Herschel, *Results of Astronomical Observations Made during the Years 1834-1838 at the Cape of Good Hope* (London, 1847), pp. 432-434, *Outlines of Astronomy* (London, 1849), pp. 227-229.

²⁵ Dominique François Arago, *Popular Lectures on Astronomy* (New York, 1845), p. 30.

²⁶ Frances M. Brookfield, *The Cambridge Apostles* (New York, 1906), pp. 349-350.

²⁷ Tennyson habitually used the plural of the third personal pronoun to refer vaguely to scientists, e.g., *In Memoriam* cxviii, 7, *Despair*, l. 87, *The Charge of the Heavy Brigade at Balaklava*, l. 368.

THE SOURCES OF *THE PRINCE AND THE PAUPER*

Mark Twain, we usually say, was a remarkably independent writer, one who wrote primarily from experience and was anything but bookish. Such a view has, of course, much truth in it. And yet he did refer to books in his writing. We know that he read about foreign countries before and during the writing of the travel books. He read widely, also, in preparing to write his historical books. Of these, *The Prince and the Pauper* offers some interesting problems. It is clear what the sources are, for Clemens acknowledges his indebtedness in notes appearing at the end of the volume. I am concerned with how he used the sources and why he admitted dependence on them.¹

The work most frequently cited in connection with Clemens' book is Charlotte M. Yonge's juvenile, *The Prince and the Page* (1865). No critic, however, points to similarities in the two books, for they are entirely different.² Clemens' biographer believed that the earlier story, an historical romance laid in the thirteenth century, might have "inspired" the later tale, but he concludes, rightly, that "no comparison of any sort is possible between them."³

He did borrow from books, however, in writing *The Prince and the Pauper*, as can be seen from his appended notes. Some of these refer to the book of his Hartford friend, J. Hammond Trumbull, entitled *The True-Blue Laws of Connecticut and New Haven and the False Blue-Laws*.⁴ Trumbull's book was written to show that the laws of seventeenth-century Connecticut were not so foolish or so severe as were commonly supposed, and that compared to the English statutes of the same period, the Connecticut laws were humane and enlightened, a point that Mark Twain makes in a

¹ Several students of Twain have commented on some of the sources, though not in detail. Their observations I have indicated below.

² See Stuart P. Sherman, "Mark Twain," in *Cambridge History of American Literature* (New York, 1917), III, 15-16, Edward Wagenknecht, *Mark Twain the Man and His Work* (New Haven, 1935), p. 43, and Arthur Hobson Quinn, *American Fiction* (New York, 1936), p. 250. These writers follow Paine on this point. See Albert Bigelow Paine, *Mark Twain, A Biography* (New York, 1912), II, 596-597.

³ Paine, *Biography*, II, 597, n. 1.

⁴ (Hartford, 1876). Professor Quinn mentions Trumbull's book in *American Fiction*, p. 250.

"General Note" at the end of his volume. In order to show that what was harsh in the Connecticut laws was of English origin, Trumbull included in his introduction several cases involving infringement of the severe laws in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was from these cases, as his notes show, that Mark Twain borrowed for his story—borrowed accounts of persons losing their ears, being branded, being burned to death, boiled to death (sometimes in oil), hanged for such offenses as larceny above twelve pence, stealing a horse, a hawk, and so on.⁵

Another source which he used in much the same way was *The English Rogue*, a seventeenth-century English book by Richard Head and Francis Kirkman.⁶ Several details in Chapters 17 and 18 of *The Prince and the Pauper* he took, sometimes without acknowledgment, from Chapters 5, 6, and 7 of the English tale. Clemens' chapters treating the low life of London include canting terms,⁷ a snatch of song,⁸ dialogue,⁹ description,¹⁰ and episodes,¹¹ all of which are to be found in *The English Rogue*. At times he sticks close to his original, as is evident from the following passages, dealing with the set speech of beggars asking for coins.

The English Rogue

For Gods sake some tender hearted Christians, cast through your merciful eyes one pittiful look upon a sore, lame, and miserable wretch Bestow one penny or half-penny upon him that is ready to perish, &c.¹²

The Prince and the Pauper

" o' God's name cast through your merciful eyes one pitiful look upon a sick, forsaken, and most miserable wretch, bestow one little penny out of thy riches upon one smitten of God and ready to perish! " ¹³

⁵ See the notes at the end of *The Prince and the Pauper*, which are made up largely of direct quotations from Clemens' sources.

⁶ (London, 1665-1680). The edition Clemens probably used was a facsimile reprint in four volumes, issued without publisher's imprint, in 1874. See the catalogues of the British Museum and the Library of Congress.

⁷ *The Prince and the Pauper* (Uniform Edition), p. 162, *The English Rogue*, I, 38.

⁸ *The Prince and the Pauper*, p. 161, *The English Rogue*, I, 45-46.

⁹ *The Prince and the Pauper*, pp. 173-174, *The English Rogue*, I, 62.

¹⁰ *The Prince and the Pauper*, p. 209, *The English Rogue*, I, 61-62.

¹¹ *The Prince and the Pauper*, pp. 211-218, *The English Rogue*, I, 63-64.

¹² I, 62.

¹³ P. 173. See also, for a close following of the source, the description of the "chime," or artificial sore. *The Prince and the Pauper*, p. 209, *The English Rogue*, I, 61-62. This parallel is noted in Quinn, *American Fiction*, p. 251.

At other times Mark Twain elaborates on his original, as, for instance, when he takes an episode, treated in two pages in the source, and expands it to fill six pages, adding detail and dialogue that make the incident more dramatic.¹⁴ But whether he followed his source closely or whether he elaborated on it, he borrowed for the same purpose to give an air of authenticity to his book.¹⁵ He read a good deal to prepare himself for writing the book,¹⁶ and he was interested not only in making it authentic, but in making it *appear* authentic.

Several points are clear regarding Clemens' use of sources in *The Prince and the Pauper* (1) he used source material to acquaint himself with the period he was writing about, (2) for the most part he followed his sources quite closely, taking specific things from them, (3) usually, but not always, he acknowledged his debt to a source, either in a footnote or in a note at the end of the volume. This last point calls for comment.

Granted that he had a respect for facts,¹⁷ why did Clemens want to document a work of fiction? Two explanations seem likely. One has to do with his purpose in writing the book. He wrote with serious intent, trying to give his readers "a realizing sense of the exceeding severity of the laws of that day by inflicting some of their penalties upon the King himself and allowing him a chance to see the rest of them applied to others."¹⁸ So anxious was he

¹⁴ The episode involves the appearance before a justice of a felon—the young king in *The Prince and the Pauper*, pp. 211-218, the narrator in *The English Rogue*, I, 63-64.

¹⁵ Says Paine: "He decided to be quite accurate in his picture of the period, and he posted himself on old London very carefully. He bought a pocket map which he studied in the minutest detail" (*Biography*, II, 598).

¹⁶ Besides the works mentioned, Clemens acknowledges as sources David Hume, *History of England* (London, 1754-1762), J. Heneage Jesse, *London, its Celebrated Characters and Remarkable Places* (London, 1871), and John Timbs, *Curiosities of London* (new edition, London, 1868). It seems likely that he borrowed more from these books than his notes indicate. The salient facts in his treatment of London Bridge, for instance (*The Prince and the Pauper*, pp. 95-98), he could have obtained from Timbs' *Curiosities*, pp. 65-69.

¹⁷ "I like history, biography, travels, curious facts and strange happenings, and science. And I detest novels, poetry, and theology" (*Biography*, I, 512).

¹⁸ Letter to William Dean Howells, in Albert Bigelow Paine (ed.), *Mark Twain's Letters* (New York, 1917), I, 377.

for the book to be taken seriously, that he considered publishing it anonymously.¹⁹ Regarded at the time strictly as a funny man, he feared that the name Mark Twain on the title page would inevitably suggest humor. If the documentation were missing, certainly some of the details of the story would seem, to one unacquainted with Tudor history, to be Mark Twain "whoppers." It was precisely this that Clemens wanted to avoid.

The other explanation concerns Mark's theory of fiction. Fiction based on fact, he seemed to think, was superior to purely imaginative writing. We are told in *The Gilded Age*, for instance, that "The incidents of the explosion [of a steamboat] are not invented. They happened just as they are told."²⁰ Similarly, in the preface to *Tom Sawyer*, Clemens writes: "Most of the adventures recorded in this book really occurred." He makes the same point in the preface to *A Connecticut Yankee*: "The ungentle laws and customs touched upon in this tale are historical, and the episodes which are used to illustrate them are also historical." Again, a footnote at the beginning of Chapter 1 in *Tom Sawyer, Detective* is to the same effect: "Strange as the incidents of this story are, they are not inventions, but facts—even to the public confession of the accused." If the story is true, Clemens thought, if it is based on fact, it is somehow better than if it were wholly imaginary. Such a theory of fiction, common enough in the West of his day,²¹ would go far toward explaining the presence of documentation in *The Prince and the Pauper*.

LEON T. DICKINSON

University of Missouri

¹⁹ *Mark Twain's Letters*, I, 390.

²⁰ *The Gilded Age* (Uniform Edition), I, 54.

²¹ One critic writes that Clemens "was reared in an atmosphere where history and biography were regarded as more worthy the attention of a grown man than imaginative writing could possibly be" (Wagenknecht, *Mark Twain*, p. 49). Another writer speaks of the prejudice against fiction that Western writers had to overcome. Missouri writers, he says, wrote "conciliatory prefaces which they prefixed to their novels, even until late in the nineteenth century. They were at least careful to point out that their novels were based on fact and that they would teach good moral lessons" (Carle Brooks Spotts, *The Development of Fiction on the Missouri Frontier* [1830-1860], Abstract of a Thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1933. Reprinted from *The Missouri Historical Review* for April, July, and October, 1934, and January, April, and July, 1935 [Vols. 28-29]).

THE COACHMAN'S PART IN THE PUBLICATION OF
POEMS BY TWO BROTHERS

The tradition that *Poems by Two Brothers*, the juvenile verse of Charles and Alfred Tennyson, was published at the instigation of their father's coachman has had a persistent currency in works on the laureate. It appears to have been first recorded in print by J. Cuming Walters, who, in 1890 in *In Tennyson Land*, gave the following account of the coachman's supposed part:

The story of how they came to decide on submitting their poems to a printer is slightly apocryphal, but the current tradition is that it was due to the suggestion of none other than Dr. Tennyson's coachman.

Alfred Tennyson, finding that time hung heavy on his hands, was seized with a longing to visit the Lincolnshire Churches, many of which are of high historical interest. But "the eternal want of pence" made the projected tour impossible. By some means or other the old servant learned of Alfred's disappointment. He must have been a man of resource, for after some cogitation he exclaimed, "Why, Master Alfred, you are always writing poetry—why don't you sell it?" The idea surprised but pleased the young man, he consulted Charles, and when next the coachman drove to Louth, a collection of poems in manuscript went with him and was deposited at the shop of J. Jackson, who occasionally published books by arrangement with a London firm.

As to whether this story should or should not be accepted I say nothing, but that the manuscript was left in Jackson's hands and ultimately purchased by him is a matter of history.¹

The admission at the outset that the tale is "slightly apocryphal" and the disavowal of responsibility for its veracity at the conclusion clearly manifest Walters's awareness that the story was of the most dubious authenticity.²

By 1893, when Walters published his second book, *Tennyson Poet, Philosopher, Idealist*, he seems to have become convinced of the spurious nature of his anecdote as far as the coachman was concerned, since he omitted any mention of him, writing only,

¹ (London, George Redway), pp. 41-42.

² P. Graham Anderson, who reviewed *In Tennyson Land* at some length in *The Scots Observer* for February 15, 1890 (III, 352-353) and carped at Walters for slipshod methods and inaccuracies, somewhat curiously fails to take him to task about the story of the coachman's suggestion to Alfred of publishing. In fact, Anderson retails it in his critique, does not make it apparent that Walters has used it, and leaves the impression that it resulted from his own researches in Lincolnshire.

There may be some truth in the curious story related to me that publication was decided upon in order that a little money might be obtained to enable the boys to carry out a long cherished project of visiting the Lincolnshire churches. Suffice it that a selection of the compositions was made and taken to Jackson of Louth, who sometimes risked the printing of books.³

But before this retrenched version appeared, the coachman had been accepted into the canon. When Arthur Waugh's *Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Study of His Life and Work* was published in October, 1892, substantially the original account by Walters was repeated with a few embellishments of detail added and with the reservations about the genuineness excluded.⁴

Hugh F. A. Fausset in *Tennyson: A Modern Portrait*, 1923, continued the acceptance of the tradition with the categorical statement that the two young Tennysons submitted their poems to Jackson "on the advice of an enterprising family coachman."⁵

Recently, Professor William D. Paden, in his study of Tennyson's early imagery, *Tennyson in Egypt*, 1942, while stating that Walters reports local tradition, has lent credence to the story of the coachman by saying of it, "This may well be the truth," and by furnishing the names of two men who have been identified as coachman to Tennyson's father.⁶

An unpublished letter, however, from the poet's son, Hallam Tennyson, to Theodore Watts (later Watts-Dunton) seems to dispose effectively of the coachman's claim to notice in the record of Tennyson's literary career. Watts, a leading reviewer for *The Athenaeum* since 1876, had apparently sent to Farringford a copy of that paper for February 15, 1890, in which an extract from a letter by Hallam, denying Walters's claims of representations of Lincolnshire scenes and persons in a number of Tennyson's poems, was published under the heading "THE LOCALIZING CRAZE." A paragraph immediately below the extract, and presumably by Watts,

³ (London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company), p. 10.

⁴ (London, William Heinemann), pp. 16-17. It appeared on the same pages in the second edition in 1893, and in the third and revised edition of 1894, it is reprinted, unaltered, pp. 14-15.

⁵ (London, Selwyn and Blount), p. 4.

⁶ (Lawrence, Kansas, The University of Kansas Press), pp. 117-118, n. 4.

deplored the unimaginative temper of the age⁷ In acknowledgment of Watts's kindness, Hallam wrote as follows⁸

Fairingford
Feb 17/90

Dear Mr Theodore Watts

Thank you for the Athenæum—the happy 'localizing craze'—& your little paragraph The Scots Observer sets upon Mr Walter does it not?⁹

Did you see a letter in the Globe last week signed by a man who said that he knew that part of Lincolnshire?¹⁰ full of lies—notably that my grandfather was an inveterate smoker (he never touched a pipe or a cigar in his life)

that my grandmother was very unpractical and wd forget the Sunday dinners & hastily order a couple of ducks to be killed in a neighbouring farm yard (for a family of 14 if you please),

and that my Father often went to Hagworthingham Church—where the writers mother saw him He never went to the church in his life

These are the stories picked up by curiosity hunters from some of the old people I suppose who gull these tourists to perfection

No one living then knew him except I believe one Clark who says that he does not remember anything particular about him and another Susan Epton, a blind woman The tradition of their coachman having advised my Father & Uncle to publish is wholly false—They were the most illiterate peasants in Eng'land—and the coachman among them

We hope your cold is gone

Ys vy tly

Hallam Tennyson

At the time that this letter was written, Hallam was acting as

⁷ *The Athenæum*, No 3251, p 214

⁸ The letter, now in the Duke University Library, is published with the permission of the librarian, Dr B E Powell, and of the trustees of the Tennyson estate, granted through Sir Charles Tennyson with his characteristic kindness

⁹ Hallam here refers to the review, mentioned in note 2, by P Graham Anderson, *The Scots Observer* (February 15, 1890), III, 352-353 Anderson says of Walters, "Instead of proving his loyalty by completeness in research and accuracy of detail, he is content to be so slovenly and slipshod that even in the act of gushing fluently and piously about 'the noble poet' he commonly stumbles into errors which decent pains would have enabled him to avoid The result is such a jumble of bad guide book and worse criticism as none can read with patience or remember without scorn" (p 352)

¹⁰ *The Globe and Traveller*, February 12, 1890, No 29, 549, p 3 The letter, the details of which Hallam recounts fairly fully, was signed "WOLD HILL"

his father's amanuensis and must have discussed the contents of *In Tennyson Land*¹¹ with him before he wrote the letter to *The Athenæum* about Walters's assertions. Consequently there seems little reason to doubt that Hallam's emphatic denial of the part assigned to the coachman carries the authority of Tennyson and is to be regarded as final.

EDGAR F. SHANNON, JR

Merton College, Oxford

NOTES ON HISPANIC POETRY

In his article "Sonetti Spagnuoli Tradotti in Italiano 2 Un Sonetto Italiano Tradotto in Spagnuolo e Sonetti Spagnuoli Tradotti in Italiano," in *Bulletin Hispanique*, xvi, 1914, 451-57, Eugenio Mele draws attention to imitations by Cetina and Acuña of the following Italian poem

Vorrei saper da voi come egli è fatta
quella rete d'amor che tanti à presi,
comme po' circondar tanti paesi
e comme il tempo oimà non l'a disfatta
E sì l'è ceco amor comme se adatta
a far i stral(1) da se foco accesi,
e tanti che n'a dati che n'a spesi
Vorrei saper da voi donde li acatta,
e se l'è ver quel ch'a[n] scritto i poeti
da una man l'arco tien, l'altra la face,
comme po' opear ne stral nè rete
Or dica pur quel che li pare e piace,
ch'amore à l'arco, le saette e rete,
solo è un bel viso che diletta e piace

(Cf. A. Saviotti, "Un Codice Musicale del Secolo XVI," *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, xiv, 1889, 227)

¹¹ George G. Napier's *The Homes and Haunts of Tennyson*, Privately printed, 1889, revised and enlarged ed., Glasgow, James Maclehose and Sons, 1892, and Alfred Church's *The Laureate's Country*, London, Seeley and Company, 1891, "were the only two topographical books concerning him which he considered at all correct" (Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Tennyson A Memoir by His Son*, New York and London, The Macmillan Company, 1897, II, 363-364)

After reproducing the imitations Mele states "Che il Cetina e l'Acuña traducessero un sonetto nostro non è a meravigliarsi in Ispagna nel Cinquecento tradurre dagl'italiani si riteneva press'a poco lo stesso che far di proprio" (*op cit* 455) Though right insofar as Cetina is concerned he is wrong regarding Acuña, as a glance at their two sonnet versions will show

Quería saber, amantes, ¿cómo es hecha	Dígame quien lo sabe ¿cómo es hecha
esta amorosa red que a tantos prende?	La red de Amor que tanta gente prende?
¿Cómo su fueza en todo el mundo extiende	y cómo habiendo tanto que la tiende
o cómo el tiempo ya no la ha deshecha?	¿no esta del tiempo ya rota o deshecha?
Si Amor es ciego, ¿cómo se aprovecha a hacer saetas con que ofende?	y cómo es hecho el arco que Amor flecha,
Si no las hace Amor, ¿quien se las vende?	pues hierro ni valor se la defiende?
¿Con cual tesoro compra tanta flecha?	y cómo o donde halla, ¿quien la vende
Y si tiene, como escriben los poetas,	de plomo, plata y oro tanta flecha?
En una mano el arco, en otra el fuego,	Y si dicen que es niño, ¿cómo viene a vencer los gigantes? y si es ciego,
Las saetas, la red, ¿con qué las tira?	¿cómo toma al tirar cierta la mira?
Las armas del Amor tirano ciego,	Y si (como se escribe) siempre tiene en una mano el arco, en otra el fuego,
Un volver de ojos es que alegre os mira	¿cómo tiende la red y cómo tira?
No el arco, ni la red, fuego y saetas	(<i>Varias Poesías de D. Hernando de Acuña</i> , Salamanca, 1591, fol 97)
(Cetina, <i>Obras</i> [ed. Hazafías y la Rúa] Sevilla, 1895, I, 160)	

The question of the precedence of the Acuña version can easily be settled by an examination of the end-rimes in the two Spanish compositions. They are identical in the octaves and, with one exception, the same in the sestets, proving that Cetina is the source.¹

In an article on "Bernardo de Balbuena's *Siglo de Oro* and its Sources," *Hispanic Review*, xv, 1947, 163, I have pointed out that the verses of his sonnet in the first eclogue "¿Viste Alcino

" are a contamination of a passage from Sannazaro and one from Garcilaso. In "237 Sonnets" published by Foulché del Bosc in *Revue Hispanique*, xviii, 1908, 562, we find a partially plagiar-

¹ Acuña was so pleased with his version that he composed three sonnet-answers to it, *per le rime*. See Mele, *op cit*, 453-55

ized version of the Balbuena poem attributed to Don Juan de Almeyda Compañe

¿Viste, Alcino, por dicha en la montaña
de algun inculto risco la dureza,
del enciespado golfo la aspereza
cuando el revuelto céfiro le ensaña?
¿La dura encina, la mudable caña
del javalí acosado la fiereza,
del invierno el rigor, y la braveza
del fuego apoderado en la cabaña?
Pues con el trato de mi ingrata bella,
aquella tan cruel como divina,
la peña es blanda, el mar tiene
sosiego,
y al fin parecieran flores cabella (*sic*)
el risco, el golfo, el céfiro, la encina,
la caña, el javalí, el invierno y
fuego

(Balbuena, *Siglo de Oro* Ma-
drid, 1821, 10 11)

Alcida, ¿ves por dicha la montaña
de aquel bieñoso risco la dureza?
¿Viste en el mar acaso la fiereza
del reboltoso viento que se ensaña?
¿Viste el coraje, el impetu y la saña
del javalí acosado en la maleza,
la furia, el descontento, la aspereza
del encendido Marte en la campaña?
Buelve, Alcida, veras la roja llama
qual va por el jara! a aquesta mano
del animoso zéfiro encendida
con el furor que [a]lviva, cruze y
brama,
talando por do passa el monte y
llano
Pues mucho más cruel eres Alcida
(Almeyda in "237 Sonnets," *op*
cit ²)

As the Balbuena lines are fitted into a pastoral setting similar to its originals while Almeyda's sonnet is an isolated piece, it is safe to assume that the latter is copied from the *Siglo de Oro*. If this is true, it must very likely have been composed after 1608, the date of the first publication of Balbuena's pastoral. This date clearly indicates that the author of "Alcida, ¿ves" cannot be Juan de Almeida, *rector* of the University of Salamanca, friend of Fray Luis de León, who died in 1573, and several of whose poems appear in the *Cartapacios Salmantinos*, a group of manuscripts now in the Biblioteca Real.³ On the other hand, he may with a good deal of certainty be identified with Juan de Almeida, *el Sabio*, a Portuguese writer,⁴ who was the editor of the poems of Francisco

² A second version with variants is to be found in the same collection, *op cit*, 562 63

³ On the *rector* see A. Coster, "Sur Francisco de la Torre," *Revue Hispanique*, LXV, 1925, 101 02, 121 26, and J. P. W. Crawford, "Francisco de la Torre and Juan de Almeida," *Modern Language Notes*, XLII, 1927, 367 68. The contents of the *Cartapacios* are listed by R. Menéndez Pidal in *Boletín de la Academia Española*, I, 1914, 43-55, 151-70, 298-320.

⁴ The Portuguese origin of Almeida is strengthened by the fact that he is an imitator of Camoens in at least two of his sonnets, *A la sombra*

de la Torre, and who, according to Aureliano Fernández Guerra y Orbe was none other than Torre himself ⁵ The patent plagiarism in our sonnet and the mediocrity of the other compositions attributed to the same author in "237 Sonnets" ⁶ as compared to those in Torre's poems ⁷ prove that the same man could hardly have written both

One of Lope de Vega's most popular lyric poems, the somewhat elusive *¡Pobre barquilla mía*, which first appeared in Act III of his *Dorotea*, deviates towards the end from its highly personalized tone by drawing upon literary tradition. Lope (Fernando) expresses his desire to join his beloved lady in heaven

Sí con eternas plantas
las fijas luces doas,
¡oh dueño de mi barca!
y en dulce paz reposas,
merezca que le pidas
al Bien que eterno gozas
que adonde estas me lleve,
mas pura y mas hermosa

Garcilaso had expressed the same idea in his first eclogue.

Divina Elisa, pues agora el cielo,
con inmortales pies pisas y mides,
y su mudanza ves, estando queda,
¿por qué de mí te olvidas, y no pides
que se apresure el tiempo en que este velo
rompa del cuerpo, y verme libre pueda,
y en la tercera rueda
contigo mano a mano
busquemos otro llano

That here is the source of Lope is made quite clear by the identity of *eternas plantas* with *inmortales pies*. However, the second of Lope's verses reminds us, in addition, of the fifth eclogue of Sanaz-

de un marto and *Si lágrimas pudiesen* *op cit*, 566-67 and 538. I now feel that I was wrong in attributing to the same man the sonnets in "237 Sonnets," and those in the *Cartapacios*. See "Notes on Spanish Renaissance Poetry," *PQ*, XI (1932), 259.

⁵ See discussion by Coster, *op cit*, 83-84, 101-09.

⁶ There are ten compositions attributed here to Juan de Almeida. Cf. *op cit*, 562-67.

⁷ *Obras del Bachiller Francisco de la Torre*. Madrid, 1631. Facsimile edition by the Hispanic Society of America, New York, 1903.

zaro, incidentally the source of the Garcilaso passage In this poem the Italian writes of Androgeo

E coi vestigi santi
Calchi le stelle erranti

The *lucos* of Lope are closer to the *stelle* of Sanazzaro than to the *cielo* of Garcilaso The fact that both Garcilaso and Sanazzaro had been mentioned earlier in Act III⁸ must have led the author of *La Dorotea* to recall and link the two great poets in this portion of the *romancillo*

Espronceda's famous "Canción del Pirata" was first printed in *El Artista*, I, 1835, 43-44 In this version the well known refrain is repeated four consecutive times virtually in the form with which we are all familiar

Que es mi barco mi tesoro
Es mi Dios la libertad
Mi ley la fuerza y el viento
Mi única patria la mar

However, contrary to our expectations, in the fifth repetition the second line appears as follows

La victoria mi deidad

Was this poor verse substituted as a printer's prank, or was it really in the manuscript original? This cannot be ascertained At any rate, the substitution has, curiously enough, never been repeated or noticed, at least in print It does not appear in the Montevideo *Imciador*, Vol I, 1838,⁹ despite the fact that parenthesized italics at the end bear the words (*Del Artista*) The so-called *editio princeps* of 1840, *Poesías de D José de Espronceda*, does not use it, nor do any of the subsequent editions consulted Furthermore, no comment is made on it by Georges Le Gentil in *Les Revues littéraires de l'Espagne pendant la première moitié du XIX siècle*, Paris, 1909, chapter XII, "El Artista," 42-49, and Northup in *Estudiante de Salamanca and Other Selections*, Boston, 1919, both of whom have examined the version in *El Artista* Nor is there any statement on this score in *El Artista* (Madrid, 1835-1836), an

⁸ Cf *La Dorotea* (*Las Cien Mejores Obras de la Literatura Española* Vol 65), Madrid, Compañía Ibero Americana de Publicaciones, pp 31 and 55

⁹ I have made use of *El Imciador* Reproducción fac similar Buenos Aires, Guillermo Kraft, 1941

index published by José Simón Díaz, Madrid, 1946¹⁰ How can this oversight be explained? In part, no doubt, because the refrain is so simple and easy to memorize after four repetitions that the eye is tricked into reading what is in the mind rather than on the printed page. It is a most interesting example of perseveration of illusion.

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

Northwestern University

TOURGUENEFF'S NEW YEAR'S GREETING TO FLAUBERT

On Tuesday, January 2, 1877, Ivan Tourgueneff sent Flaubert a brief note. "Il y transcrit simplement," says M. Gérard Gailly,¹ "on ne sait pourquoi, une poésie pitoyable faite par un maître d'école à l'occasion du nouvel an."

The *pourquoi* of this greeting, which puzzles M. Gailly, is explained for us by Zola. He writes of Flaubert:

La bêtise l'attirait par une sorte de fascination. Quand il avait découvert un document de grosse sottise, c'était pour lui un épanouissement, il en parlait pendant des semaines. Je me souviens qu'il s'était procuré un recueil de pièces de vers uniquement écrites par des médecins, il nous forçait à en écouter des morceaux qu'il lisait de sa voix la plus retentissante. A Croisset, il avait d'étranges collections dans des cartables, des procès verbaux de gardes champêtres, des pièces de procès curieux, des images enfantines et stupides, tous les documents de l'imbécillité humaine qu'il avait pu rassembler.²

Tourgueneff was certainly familiar with Flaubert's peculiarities in this respect. Having come on a poem of more than ordinary stupidity, he would naturally send it to his friend, and since it did in lieu of the conventional New Year's greeting, it was a good joke. Flaubert certainly took the matter in this light. "Merci de votre morceau de poésie, mon bon Tourgueneff," he wrote in his reply of January 4, 1877, "il est *chouette*."³

A. E. CARTER

University of Manitoba

¹⁰ I am indebted to Prof. W. S. Hendrix for the loan of this volume.

¹ Gustave Flaubert, *Lettres inédites à Tourgueneff*, présentation et notes par Gérard Gailly. Monaco: Editions du Rocher, 1946, p. 127.

² *Les Romanciers naturalistes*. Paris: Charpentier, p. 195.

³ Flaubert, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

REVIEWS

The James Family, Including Selections from the Writings of Henry James, Senior, William, Henry, & Alice James By F O MATTHIESSEN New York Alfred A Knopf, 1947 Pp xvi + 706 + viii \$6 75

The Notebooks of Henry James Edited by F O MATTHIESSEN and KENNETH B MURDOCK New York Oxford University Press, 1947 Pp xxviii + 425 \$6 00

In *The James Family* Professor Matthiessen departs from the customary method of biographers on these grounds

Since the James family's essential biography is internal rather than external, a biography of minds in action, it can best be presented in their own language Too many biographies of writers merely skirt or take for granted what gives their subjects their chief claim upon our interest, but by far the most revelatory material for understanding the James family consists of letters and journals and essays, some hitherto unprinted, the bulk widely scattered in several dozen different volumes, most of which are out of print and hard to come by

The members of the family speak for themselves in what is not simply a biography but a "comprehensive anthology" as well Professor Matthiessen speaks of his function as "something like that of the director of a play," whose drama "finds its center in what happened in that family circle" His "more elementary aim has been to uncover the sources of their seminal ideas in the matrix that formed them, and then to discover what I could of the implications of these ideas, not in isolation, but through whatever juxtapositions, comparisons, and contrasts I could contrive to bring them into" Instead of moving from a fictionalized version of the careers of these remarkable people to their work, Professor Matthiessen undertakes to move from work to work, from theme to theme, as if the family were characters in a species of nineteenth century *Symposium* The notion is at first sight interesting, especially since it brings into play the talent for juxtaposition and contrast demonstrated in the author's *American Renaissance* But it signally fails for the clearest of reasons, no one is present to bear the full critical responsibility, the responsibility of evaluation and judgment The director holds a reading, but the finished performance, which depends on his ability to marshal his scenes in such a way that they acquire cumulative significance, never takes place The book might better be called "Annotated Readings in the Jameses"

Nonetheless *The James Family* has its value and its uses Book Five (which runs to more than one hundred and sixty pages)

gathers together criticism of Emerson, Carlyle, Hawthorne and others by the Jameses. Although the work as a whole does not much enrich our sense of what went on in the family circle, it does give us excellent opportunities to see the members of that circle facing outward and appraising the world about them. Professor Matthiessen does his freshest work as a biographer in his second book where he deals with the children's education and their relations with their parents. His first book is best avoided by those who seek an introduction to the elder Henry James. (Ralph Barton Peary's *Thought and Character of William James* has the soundest account as far as it goes.) Book Three includes letters and extracts designed to show how each of the children found his bent (or failed to), to illustrate the discussion among the family on the question of residence abroad, and a last section on William's and Henry's views of each other's work. The most important of the seventy-odd unpublished letters Matthiessen has used is here printed in full (pp. 259-63). This is the long letter from Henry to William on Minny Temple's death. The fourth, sixth and seventh books, and the Epilogue (which leans heavily on Santayana) hardly seem worth the effort of compilation.

I felt while reading Professor Matthiessen's comments on William James and his father that his sense of the configuration and relative importance of ideas is somehow deficient. Is it not extraordinarily naive to assume as he does that William James is a solely sufficient interpreter of his father's work? The theology and psychology of the elder James, as I have elsewhere noted, give him the interest accruing to one of the forerunners of Freud. Precisely because he was not a moralist in psychology his assertions about the psyche have more interest for us than do William's. Letting the Jameses speak for themselves often seems to mean letting them justify their own blindness *vis à vis* one another. Professor Matthiessen says in another place that the difference between William's work and Henry's "might be put as the contrast between the subjective and the objective ways of taking life." Such a shrugging-off of problems leads us to wonder what "family" means in Professor Matthiessen's title. The answer lies, I think, in such sentences as this about the elder James: "We may discriminate his particular quality by pondering the coincidence that he was born eight years after Emerson, and eight years before Melville." Or again, speaking of a group of William's letters, "taken together they are designed, not to catalogue all the tenets of his philosophy, but to immerse the reader in the main currents of an American mind in action." Professor Matthiessen is not concerned with the family as a family, nor with the meaning each of its members might have for us in the context of our days and ways. He is concerned with the American past as a backdrop against which his characters move like figures in a pageant commemorating an event which is never named. We learn what the pageant is about by asking ourselves—what is here

thought of as distinctively American? The answer, taking the book as a whole, appears to be the James family, Emerson Melville, and so on. The exhibition is held to be self-sufficient, to carry its own meaning on its face. No explanations or judgments of the Jameses are required because they produced works which exhibit the final virtue—aesthetic form. Apparently, one may reinstate aestheticism if one makes it the substance of history.

This will suggest the strength and limitations of Professor Matthiessen's treatment of Henry James. He quotes an essay on Flaubert in which James says that there are two ways in which the novelist can handle his material. "The more he feels his subject the more he *can* render it—that is the first way. The more he renders it the more he can feel it—that is the second way. The second way was unmistakably Flaubert's." It is likewise, Matthiessen adds, Henry James's way and the way of any writer who feels "the supreme importance of form." With this one can agree *without* admitting that what Matthiessen elsewhere calls the novelist's "aesthetic idealism" is in effect a system of morals. The artist says something, and whatever that something may be, it is something other than his form. Aesthetic form no doubt makes history possible, in the sense that it makes what others have done apprehensible—but morality makes it intelligible, and this was Henry James's chief insight.

The Notebooks of Henry James is a handsome volume containing, in addition to the nine notebooks, "The 'K. B. Case' and 'Mrs. Max'" (a sketch of an unwritten novel), some notes for *The Sense of the Past* rather less interesting than those previously published, and the first complete version of the "Project for *The Ambassadors*." The notebooks relate to the period November, 1878 to May, 1911. Some notebooks have been lost, but all the novels and most of the stories completed after 1878 are either discussed or mentioned. There are tantalizing blanks during the period of the composition of the last three novels. The second notebook (1881) includes an autobiographical sketch, and others have material for *The American Scene* and a projected book on London.

The remainder of the notebooks discuss and develop the situations James employs in his fiction. Prospero in his study is not for the most part an arresting figure. He lays down the barest, the thinnest of directions for creating effects which, upon their realisation, take our breath away. *The Golden Bowl* is first outlined as a commonplace little short story, and it makes one gasp to try to imagine how the gap between this scheme and the novel was bridged. Many a budding scholar will no doubt make it his business to leap this gap, but I think it wiser to take a more roundabout road. We have in the *Notebooks* a basis for the Prefaces. But since we are not Henry James it would be delusive to think we had a basis for the work itself.

Our relations with an intelligence as masterful as Henry James's are, and must always be, a little strained. The fatal thing is complacency, and it is from a two-branched complacency that most of the defects of the existing body of criticism arise. Our readiness to assume that we share the position of the artist or observer as we read, and our readiness to deal with James's international situation as if we knew just what America and Europe were like in his period, and just what he made of both—these general ideas as to his means and his materials have become barriers to a fresher reading. We may play with the painter's brushes and rummage his workshop, we may go and look at the landscape he painted, but we shall not come to understand him in this way. There is no road to James through James alone.

The only way to get at Henry James is through what he called the "enveloping air of the artist's humanity." He must be understood through our sense of other men, other manners, he must be understood as a classic is understood, through contrast and comparison, he must be placed. In the Preface to *The Portrait of a Lady* James notes that he cannot account for the genesis in his own mind of the figure of Isabel Archer. "One could answer such a question beautifully, doubtless, if one could do so subtle, if not so monstrous, a thing as to write the history of one's imagination." We, however, can do what James could not and did not wish to do, we can get at his imagination by employing a set of critical resources untapped by those who study means and materials. We can relate his work to other works of the imagination and find what is generically apprehensible in him, "the enveloping air of the artist's humanity." Most of his critics seem to feel that James was unique and breathed another air. What they fail to see is that to his fine discrimination of himself from others—to the substance of his art—we owe the opportunity afforded by every classic—the opportunity to discover some part of our generic likeness, our humanity in him. It is the exquisite difference that makes the likeness apparent. Our own threadbare version of our humanity, our opinions about technique, about America or Europe, in short our parochialism, must not be allowed to obtrude or this chance to enrich ourselves will be missed, and the process of getting at Henry James will become an exhibition of the hardened and categorized imagination of a mass-minded age.

QUENTIN ANDERSON

Columbia University

Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language By Sister MIRIAM JOSEPH, C S C New York Columbia University Press, 1947 Pp xiv + 423 \$3 75

It is important to notice the exact scope and method of this book "The purpose of this study is to present to the modern reader the general theory of composition current in Shakespeare's England. A general theory of composition, and correlatively of reading, is to be understood as one which underlies all special forms, such as the oration, the epic, the drama, whether in prose or in verse." "This study undertakes to establish four points: first, that the general theory of composition and of reading current in Shakespeare's England is to be found in one form in the contemporary works on logic and rhetoric combined, second, that it is to be found in another form in the work of the figurists which, surprisingly, treats of approximately the same matter as do logic and rhetoric texts combined, third, that these two forms, though outwardly different, are fundamentally alike, fourth, that the theory in its entire scope, whether in the one form or in the other, is, with two or three negligible exceptions, illustrated in Shakespeare's plays and poems."

An examination of the English works on logic and rhetoric leads to the conclusion that "in all of them are discernible, to a degree not hitherto adequately recognized, the dominant features of Aristotle's rhetoric." "Rhetoric, as Aristotle defines it, is the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion, and since the orator addresses a popular audience including untrained thinkers, his appeal is threefold: to their reason (*logos*), to their feelings (*pathos*), and to their confidence in his character, that is, in his virtue, competence, courtesy, good sense, good will (*ethos*). It thus appears, says Aristotle, that rhetoric is an offshoot of dialectic (*logos*) and also of ethical studies (*ethos* and *pathos*). "An examination of "The Tradition" from this point of view leads to the conclusion, "The figures may accordingly be reorganized as follows

Grammar	schemes of words, of construction the vices of language figures of repetition
<i>Logos</i>	the figures related to (a) logical topics: testimony, definition, division, genus, species, adjunct, contrary, contradictory, similarity, dissimilarity, comparison, cause, effect, antecedent, consequent, notation, conjugates (b) logical forms, as the syllogism, enthymeme, sorites, dilemma (c) the devices of disputation
<i>Pathos</i>	the figures of affection and vehemence
<i>Ethos</i>	the figures revealing courtesy, gratitude, commendation, forgiveness of injury

"The essential general theory of composition and of reading current in Shakespeare's England, as expressed in the definitions, illustrations, and comments of the Tudor logicians and rhetoricians, is presented at the end of this volume in an eclectic handbook constructed by selecting each item from the author who seems to have treated it best and by arranging the whole in the pattern outlined above. The entire theory, with a few negligible exceptions, is illustrated from Shakespeare's plays and poems in the following chapters." "There is warrant for the present reclassification in Aristotle, who furnished the pattern, and in the Renaissance rhetoricians, who implicitly adapted it." "This reclassification of the figures makes no claim to apodictic exactitude. Their classification, by whatever method, has always proved baffling, for one figure may fit into any one of a number of classes, and some figures may not fit precisely into any one. In addition to making the figures more intelligible and significant, the reorganization here presented accentuates the basic agreement of the Renaissance rhetoricians and logicians among themselves and with the ancient tradition."

The work is thus aimed at establishing a universal theory of composition, labeled Aristotelian, with Shakspeare and some of the Renaissance guide-book writers in English as illustrative materials. The present work finds its logical sequel in the author's application of it to college composition, in a further publication, *The Trivium in College Composition and Reading*, "reestablishing the trivium in the study of composition and literature, somewhat as it was exercised in the grammar schools of sixteenth century England and continental Europe." This is a most laudable objective—even if the well-beaten cynic may be a bit reminded of Don Quixote.

Shakspeare is thus the chief exhibit, through which to demonstrate this eclectic and synthetic system. He is put systematically through the handbook compiled from Renaissance sources on Aristotelian principles (modern), and is found "with two or three negligible exceptions" to illustrate everything adequately. Whether Shakspeare himself or any contemporary would so have classified each item is thus—if we accept the fundamental point of view—really beside the point.

The author, however, is genuinely interested in Shakspeare's artistry—not only in the figure, but also in the effect—, and makes numerous interesting observations on separate points. It is to be hoped that there will be much further study in detail upon the mechanics of Shakspeare's composition. "Figures" should prove to be more profitable than "images," for at least figures did have an objective existence in Shakspeare's time. Without a figure was nothing done, whether by art or by nature.

But the ideal of Shakspeareans must still be to find the exact sources used by Shakspeare himself to form and direct his habits. He and his were drilled upon the forms of composition rather than upon the general theory. Aphthonius was at that time the fourteen

minor forms of composition, each form copiously illustrated, each illustration elaborately blue-printed for compulsory imitation. Susenbrotus was one-hundred and thirty-two tabulated main figures of speech, each with that same kind of paraphernalia. The emphasis was upon the forms of composition to be put into actual practice, not upon the general theory of composition, and for Shakspeare we shall doubtless be well advised to leave it there. Else we shall have of him a learned man again.

T W BALDWIN

University of Illinois

Essai sur les Idées dans l'œuvre de Shakespeare By PAUL REYHER.
Paris: Marcel Didier, 1947. Pp. xxix + 662. Frs. 850.

This book, the first¹ of a series published by the Bibliothèque des Langues Modernes and devoted to the best productions of French critics on foreign literature, no doubt deserves high praise and stands as one of the most comprehensive and scholarly attempts at grasping Shakespeare's thought. "Les idées dans l'œuvre de Shakespeare, leurs sources, leur nature, leur développement, leur rapport et leur ensemble," such is M. Reyher's purpose, who discards at once the notion of "philosophy" which continental criticism (especially French and German) has been too apt to adopt in connection with Shakespeare's drama. If Shakespeare is a philosopher, he is so in the sense Sidney uses the word in his *Apology*. "The poet is indeed the right popular philosopher," and what we must look for in Shakespeare's plays is not a constructive philosophical system, but a commentary on life, a personal interpretation of men's passions, ideas, and actions.

Now M. Reyher's original contribution in this field is not so much to be found in an exhaustive study of Shakespeare's ideas in their final form as in the very development of those ideas from play to play. "Parmi toutes ces idées il en est que Shakespeare effleure en passant, d'autres font leur temps et disparaissent, mais il en est qu'il reprend pour développer, les préciser, les nuancer, et certaines qui se poursuivent d'un bout à l'autre de son œuvre: ce sont vraisemblablement celles auxquelles il attache le plus d'intérêt. Elles apparaissent, reparaissent au gré des ans, des lectures, des genres, des sujets." Much has been written on Shakespeare's conception of Nature, Man and the Universe, for instance, (in point of fact M. Reyher adds little to our knowledge in this respect), but few writers (if any) have hitherto attempted to follow so closely the

¹ Volumes 2 and 3 of this important collection have been published recently: *Les Chansons Élizabéthaines*, by Floris Delattre and Camille Chemin, and L. Bonnerot's essay on *Matthew Arnold, poète*. *Essai de Biographie Psychologique*.

evolution of these notions in his work. How Nature, from the picturesque background in *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, or the flightful mystery in *Macbeth* becomes a moral personality, a judge, a Law, how Man, a perfect creature of divine nature gradually reveals his weaknesses and realizes at last that his greatness lies in his self-control, his moral conscience, his sacrifice and his generosity, how things in their essence finally appear to be but shadows, "solution qui reconnaît l'existence des êtres et des choses mais leur refuse toute réalité matérielle," thus making "l'image, l'apparence" a middle term between "le néant et la matière"—these and many other fascinating questions are remarkably handled by M. Reyher, who keeps track of their development throughout Shakespeare's work and career.

For, in his opinion, such ideas cannot be separated from the life of the dramatist. "Par leur nature comme par les sujets et les genres auxquels elles se rattachent, elles correspondent à l'âge et au développement de la personnalité de l'auteur, elles revêtent ainsi, contrairement peut-être à toute attente, un certain caractère personnel." A somewhat classical view of the matter, which takes new force, however, as M. Reyher brings in a considerable amount of convincing proofs. He knows his Shakespeare almost to perfection, so well indeed that when he puts forward an opinion, we may be sure that it has been carefully examined and verified. It is this sense of "safety" the reader has in M. Reyher's company which is one of the prominent characteristics of the book. One feels that M. Reyher has been piling up notes for years, and meditating for years upon each play or sonnet of the dramatist before coming to his conclusions.

Yet the other side of the picture is that M. Reyher, while focussing his attention on ideas is inclined at times—only at times—to reduce everything to ideas. He says so himself when speaking of the historical dramas. "Tout, en fin de compte, se ramène aux idées qui confèrent aux événements leur signification et leur intérêt"—a statement which makes little indeed of the dramatic value of the characters considered as human beings. True it is that the writer is not concerned with an appreciation of characters as such, and warns us that he will only keep to ideas, but he does so in such a way as to give too much importance to the significance of the characters and to the intellectual contents of the plays. A dangerous consequence is that the characters may appear to be essentially the mediums Shakespeare uses to express ideas which he has long borne in his mind. Such is M. Reyher's opinion at bottom.

"Comment et quand ces idées lui viennent-elles? Prennent-elles naissance au moment même de la création des personnages auxquels il les prête, à la faveur des circonstances où il les place, ou bien, au contraire, les caractères et les situations lui fournissent-ils en quelque sorte l'occasion d'exprimer des idées déjà conçues et de leur

donner, en les appliquant à un cas, une valeur, une résonnance pathétique ou tragique particulière ?”

M. Reyher chooses the second solution, not taking into sufficient account, to my mind at least, that Shakespeare was chiefly busy creating Life, Life as it was in its various aspects, and as his characters saw it (often in contradictory ways) in their respective situations. His aim was *not* primarily to express ideas, but to write dramas, and we must remember, and repeat, that most of these ideas were not original and could be found scattered here and there in the dramatic and non-dramatic literature of the time. The creative power of Shakespeare only endows them with a supreme glamour, thanks to the intense life which animates his characters. That Shakespeare thus emphasizes all the characteristic ideas of his time is not so clearly pointed out in this book as it is, for instance, in Henry Fluchère's recent (and excellent) *Présentation de Shakespeare, dramaturge élisabéthain* (Cahiers du Sud, 1948), which endeavours to show the many things Shakespeare holds in common with his fellow-dramatists.

But M. Reyher cannot be blamed for what he never intended to do. And he might, after all, answer us by quoting Montesquieu's remark, as he actually does: “Je disais de Shakespeare, quand vous voyez un tel homme s'élever comme un aigle, c'est lui. Quand vous le voyez ramper, c'est son siècle.”

Such as it is, M. Reyher's *Essai* will be for the Shakespearean student not a mere catalogue of ideas, but a precious guide which he must always keep ready at hand and consult over again, if he wishes to assimilate its rich substance and appreciate the fine learning of the critic.

R. E. DAVRIL

Toulouse University

Shakespeare und der Tragödienstil seiner Zeit By LEVIN L.

SCHUCKING Bern A. Francke, 1947 Pp 175 (Sammlung Dalp, Band 45)

In *The Meaning of Hamlet* (1937) Levin L. Schucking promised to deal with the “Baroque” element in Shakespeare at a later time. The present book fulfils that promise.

Schucking defines the characteristics of Baroque tragedy: melodramatic action, multiplicity of themes, the strengthening of “spiritual dynamic” in the conflict of wills. Most important, however, is the use of exaggeration in the character development of the hero. Marlowe, Chapman, Webster, and Jonson show an exaggerated “dynamic of the will”; Kyd and Marston, an exaggerated sensibility and a morbid attitude toward life; Tourneur, an eccentric philosophy. Passion, eccentricity, singularity, self-

exaltation, the paradoxical, and the tragic appear in Shakespeare's heroes. But Schucking recognizes that the mannerisms of the time become natural in Shakespeare since his genius informs the tragedies with a strong internal necessity. The author concludes that Elizabethan tragedists have a common "art-will", that a trend toward the "ecstatic-hyperbolic-eccentric" is everywhere evident, and that this drama, though not the "high" Baroque of Dryden, may yet be called an "indigenous early Baroque".

Schucking's attempt to classify literature according to the rules of the art-historians is not new. It stems from the work of Michelet and Burkhardt. The real impetus, however, came from Heinrich Wölfflin and his *Renaissance und Barock* (1888). He concluded that a style in art represents a peculiar feeling for life which, in turn, becomes the only possible explanation for the peculiar style of an epoch. His reasoning, however, is circular. He explains the style by a study of the art. When the Baroque, for example, depicts the human body as ponderous, with bulging muscles and rustling clothes, Wölfflin decides that the peculiar feeling for life of the Baroque created both the human body and the art that depicted it. From that art he implies the feeling for life. *Und so weiter*.

Many German critics follow Wölfflin in his rounds. Schucking, Brie, L. W. Kahn, and Weisbach, to name a few. But when Brie calls Pope a Rococo figure, and Schucking puts Dryden in the "high" Baroque, what happens to the theory of art cycles? Where is the decadent Baroque? Or the early Rococo?

I feel that a much sounder criticism lies in that area for which Whitehead has used the phrase "the climate of opinion". Such criticism is intellectual, but it heeds everything that may shape an artist's attitude. Schucking hardly seems aware that his dramatists wrote for a certain kind of audience, in an Elizabethan or Jacobean London. He emphasizes external characteristics and confuses them with internal realities. In his attempt to particularize, he destroys the meaning of Renaissance and Baroque. He does not, moreover, seem to consider the work that Tillyard, Bush, Rollins, Willey, and others have done to help explain the terms that bother him.

OTTO E. SCHOEN-RENÉ

Colleges of the Seneca
Hobart and William Smith

Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics. By ROSEMOND TUVE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947. Pp. xiv + 442. \$6.00.

This book is a rather elaborate study divided into two main parts. Part I is a discussion of rhetorical commonplaces. Imitation, *ut*

pictura poesis, the Garment of Style, Sensuous Vividness (*energia*), Delightfulness, Significancy, Rhetorical Efficacy (to teach, to move, to delight), and Decorum. Part II is devoted to the "logical functions of imagery," with emphasis upon Ramus and the Ramists. The second part quite rightly overlaps the first, since logic and rhetoric, especially among the Ramists who put both *inventio* and *dispositio* under logic, were closely interlocked in Renaissance theory and practice. The second part seems better organized and more convincing than the first, perhaps because it is easy to see how and why the Ramistic doctrines would foster the use of images as a functional element in poetry.

The principal attack on the problem, in both parts, is by means of figures. The Elizabethan rhetoricians, logicians, and figurists, such as Wilson, Sherry, Ramolde, Fraunce, Peacham, and above all Puttenham are effectively employed, and there are many good illustrations from Elizabethan, Jacobean, and twentieth-century poets. Since the author is trying to show connections between metaphysical imagery and twentieth-century criticism, we would expect her show of images from Donne, Bishop King, Marvell, Herrick, Yeats, and Eliot. Quite as important for her thesis, however, are the illustrations from Spenser, Marlowe, Drayton, and Daniel. Drayton's sonnets provide typical transitional poems, which retain some of the "sixteenth-century decorativeness" and also forecast the increased logical skill of the metaphysical poets.

The author's thesis is sound. If I understand her purpose, she seeks to establish a "working contemporaneity with the Elizabethans" by demonstrating how sixteenth-century rhetoric and logic furnished a theory of imagery that included the so-called metaphysical as well as the so-called Elizabethan type. She believes, and rightly, that certain prominent contemporary critics have neglected historical criticism. She finds, and correctly, that the Elizabethans were not merely decorative in their images. "I cannot seem to discover," she writes (p. 113) "that this era departed from a conception of 'texture' as unquestionably *logically* relevant."

I wish, however, that Miss Tuve had the courage to maintain her own position more stoutly and openly. While her many parallels between contemporary poets and critics and Renaissance poets and critics are valuable, she is timid about advancing her own judgments. In fact, she seems never to escape from the spell of those twentieth-century critics and their narrow round of complexity, paradox, argument, texture, and the "ontological" nature of poetry. "I can see nothing," she writes (p. 178), "either more or less 'poetic' about either the Renaissance care to show where the poem is going or the modern habit of leaving the direction of images to be puzzled out." A sensible statement. On p. 93, however, she says that Herrick's poem "Julia's Petticoat" is "startlingly precise for its date, yet traditional." While she does not mean to imply, I suppose, that precision in poetry is confined to Donne and his

twentieth-century disciples, some readers will assume so. It seems to me that there is a tradition of precision in poetry that goes back at least as far as Homer and Sappho, just as there is a tradition of critical recognition of organic unity in art that goes back at least as far as Plato. I suspect that Miss Tuve also thinks so.

Perhaps fear of offending the contemporary "metaphysical" critics, with their praise of complexity and their dread of oversimplification, accounts for the unnecessarily complex organization of the book and for the prolix style. The author introduces *imitation*, the "crux of the matter," on p. 13, but not until p. 41 does she explain that "Elizabethan poets were far more likely to be concerned with imitating Cicero's 'intellectual ideal by reference to which the artist represents those objects which do not themselves appear to the eye' (*Orator* III, a Ciceronian commonplace in the Renaissance, in various phrasings)." If she had introduced the Ciceronian conception at the beginning of her discussion, the reader would be spared some floundering around. *Decorum*, Miss Tuve rightly maintains, governed all elements of literary composition in the Renaissance, and she constantly refers to this fundamental doctrine. It is not until the last chapter of Part I, however, that she actually defines what the Elizabethans meant by *decorum*. As to the author's own style, there are too many sentences like the following on p. 79. Speaking of the influence of critical theory on poetic practice, she writes:

The level at which the relationship to practice obtains is that at which changes do not occur each decade, but every few centuries, and, although I give dates consistently, it should be justifiable to use any critic during the period whose phraseology enables us to spy out how the typical current generalizations were understood and put to practical use.

There are no hard words here, no abstruse thought, yet most readers will have to read the sentence twice.

Miss Tuve's book contains valuable material for an understanding of poetic imagery. She has something to say. Unfortunately, or so it seems to me, the book is hard to read.

MARVIN T. HERRICK

University of Illinois

The Frontiers of Drama By UNA ELLIS-FERMOR New York
Oxford University Press, 1947 Pp vii + 154 \$3.00

To probe earnestly for ultimate philosophical meanings and not be satisfied with less has been characteristic of Miss Ellis-Fermor's earlier books on the Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights. This new work explores those frontiers or limitations which seem inherent in all drama by the very nature of its form. Such limita-

tions, Miss Ellis-Fermor believes, can be transcended by a great enough dramatist, and it is her chief concern to show by what techniques and in what themes this has sometimes happened. Three plays of this transcendent kind are discussed in separate chapters. Milton's *Samson Agonistes* overcomes, we are told, the grave difficulty of expressing religious experience in dramatic form. Shakespeare's history plays as a sequence have a spaciousness and wide suggestiveness normally proper only to the epic. And his *Troilus and Cressida* triumphs by reducing to form Shakespeare's belief in a formless and a-moral universe.

As a critic of the interior moods and meanings of a play Miss Ellis-Fermor is both sensitive and acute. She is at her best in showing the psychological and religious connections between the events leading to Samson's redemption. And she does a very interesting, if not always convincing, job of finding unity among what seem to be the numerous loose ends in *Troilus*. One begins to wonder, however, whether she is not overdoing her search for unity when she reads not only Shakespeare's history plays but also most of his tragedies as a conscious, prolonged, and systematic study of the idea of the statesman-king. This attitude presupposes a very high degree of homogeneity among numerous plays widely separated in time, and takes no account of those external factors like changes in public taste which do much to determine the nature of a playwright's work. All the emphasis is placed on his inner world, and the critic's subjective and intuitive apprehension of it, mind to mind. For, as she frankly remarks, "criticism is always in the last resort subjective." Consequently we are not surprised to find that in the attempt to fit *Troilus* with Shakespeare's other plays into a pattern of mental development, the chronological order of the plays is abandoned in favor of the "psychological sequence." *Troilus* then becomes a predecessor of *Timon* and *Lear*, and the plays closer to it in time are disregarded. By this method almost any conclusion might be reached.

In short, this book has both the weakness and the strength of a highly idealistic approach. It has great candor and modesty as well as beauty of style. One feels the urgent sincerity of the critic's search for truth. On the other hand, it somewhat blinks the grime and sweat of the world of the theatre and the possible imperfections in the work of even the greatest artist. "'Tis not Homer nods but we that sleep," therefore every play of Shakespeare must be laden with the subtlest biographical implications and connected in intricate patterns with all the other plays. There is more than a little latent perfectionism in all this. But it must be said again that Miss Ellis-Fermor demands as much of herself as she does of the authors she interprets, and has written accordingly an honest, appealing, and stimulating book.

PAUL H KOCHER

Claremont Graduate School

On the Composition of 'Paradise Lost,' A Study of the Ordering and Insertion of Material By ALLAN H. GILBERT Chapel Hill Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1947 Pp x + 185 \$3 50

Past students of Milton have ignored or evaded the difficult problem of the relationship of *Paradise Lost* to the several plans for a tragedy on the theme of *Paradise Lost* which exist in the Trinity College Manuscript of Milton's minor poems. Professor Gilbert devotes a large part of his volume to that relationship. In the course of his study, he throws a good deal of light not only on Milton's habits of composition, but also upon the interpretation of certain passages in the poem.

Gilbert shows that it is highly unlikely that *Paradise Lost* was composed from beginning to end in approximately its present sequence. Indeed, Gilbert doubts, I think rightly, whether any poem of comparable magnitude and excellence could be composed from beginning to end without significant reorganization and adjustment of material and without signs of the writer's "labor and intent study." It is exactly this labor and intent study, combined with whatever the poet's gifts may be, that results in poems of the stature of *Paradise Lost*. The quip that genius is ten per cent inspiration and ninety per cent perspiration applies to the poet as well as to geniuses in lesser fields of endeavor.

Gilbert begins his study with the speculation that Milton may have written a tragedy on the theme of *Paradise Lost*, basing this speculation upon the plans for a tragedy and upon Edward Phillips' statement that several years before *Paradise Lost* was begun he saw verses designed to be the beginning of the tragedy, some of which verses became lines 32 to 41 of Book IV of *Paradise Lost*. This speculation that Milton may have written a tragedy becomes an hypothesis that he did write a fairly complete one, and Gilbert traces in very considerable detail the influence of this hypothetical tragedy upon the epic, pointing out passages retained from it and inconsistencies that result from Milton's occasional failure to make revisions necessary to the change of plan, and analysing the epic material which could not have been included in the dramatic treatment and which must therefore be of later composition—and, indeed, of later invention. Finally, after pointing out some "inconsistencies and insertions," Gilbert provides a table showing the sequence in which he believes the various parts of the poem were composed. "None of my observations," Gilbert says in his preface, "is intended to be dogmatic", and in order to avoid the appearance of being over-positive, he presents many of his conclusions in the form of rhetorical questions. Does he not imply their answers somewhat positively, however?

In his discussion, Gilbert points out inconsistencies (some im-

portant, some very minor) which previous students of Milton have failed to notice or have tried to explain away, and to point them out is a useful service. For example, the suggestion that the episode of Abdiel is an interpolation is an aid to the interpretation of the poem. There are others.

Gilbert's analysis of probable changes in the order of parts of *Paradise Lost*, his identification of passages which may be interpolations, his explanation of certain inconsistencies between the epic as it stands and the "Arguments" prefixed to the several books, may be accepted in large part whether or not the hypothesis of a completed drama is accepted. There are parallels in the manuscript of *Comus*, of which Gilbert might have made more in illuminating Milton's habits of composition. For example, the epilogue of *Comus*, as it was published in 1645, includes 19 lines which are prologue in the Bridgewater Manuscript and includes material in lines cancelled at the beginning of the poem in the Trinity Manuscript. There are excisions and marginal interpolations in the Trinity Manuscript, too, even though it is far from being a first draft. Laboring under the hardship of his blindness, it would be surprising if Milton had not left signs of such revisions even in the final version of *Paradise Lost*.

The plans in the Trinity Manuscript and Phillips' testimony put beyond argument the fact that Milton projected a tragedy on "Adam Unparadiz'd." But Gilbert's reader is not likely to be convinced that this tragedy was actually written. He is more likely to believe that many of the inconsistencies which Gilbert explains in terms of the tragedy need little more explanation than the observation that *Paradise Lost* is a very long poem composed over a period of years by a blind poet whose memory, however remarkable, was still subject to the imperfections of his humanity.

JOHN S. DIEKHOF

Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.

John Milton at St. Paul's School: a Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education. By DONALD LEMEN CLARK.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. xii + 269.
\$3.50.

This is a full, an important, a satisfying book much needed by students of Milton and of the seventeenth century. It is the product of long study and was begun, Professor Clark tells us, "as the first step towards understanding the influence which classical and post-classical rhetoric had on Milton as a great writer of poetry and prose in Latin and in English." Convinced that Milton was

trained in rhetoric as a schoolboy, Professor Clark has sought "to reconstruct the course of study which he most probably followed and to describe the textbooks of grammar and rhetoric which he studied and memorized and the classical authors he imitated in the themes he wrote in Latin and Greek prose and verse"

In this purpose Professor Clark has succeeded wholly. In eight packed chapters he has demonstrated beyond doubt that rhetoric (or logic, which, for the Ramists, included rhetoric) was the very center of Milton's education up to the time when he matriculated at Christ's College, and we learn from this book not only how much Milton's schooling consisted in rhetoric but also the precise character of the rhetorical precepts and exercises by means of which the great poet was prepared for the mature use of language.

Indeed, Professor Clark has succeeded in far more than he modestly claims for his book. He has been able to bring to life, and to give his reader a sense of intimate familiarity with, St. Paul's School, its masters, and pupils, thereby making it possible for us to know Milton better. He has revealed how and exactly when Milton came under the influence of Ramus. He has, like A. F. Leach years ago and Davis P. Harding more recently, found reason to believe that Milton entered St. Paul's much earlier than 1620.¹ He has suggested that Milton's Puritanism was intensified by the younger Gill's deep hatred of James I and Buckingham. He has shown that the importance of Christian authors in the curriculum of St. Paul's has hitherto been over-emphasized, that in Milton's day the school founded by Colet according to a pattern shaped by Erasmus was an almost perfect embodiment of the educational ideals of Renaissance humanism. (In fact, one might almost say—though Professor Clark does not—that Milton went to school to Erasmus and Colet, so strongly and completely did their ideas dominate St. Paul's when Milton was a boy.) Throughout the book, the author has related his findings to particular passages in the works of Milton, and, although these detailed illuminations are scattered, they add up to a great deal of new light on the poetry, the prose, the life, and the period of Milton.

Milton at St. Paul's has just enough minor flaws to cut it off this side of perfection without seriously diminishing its value. It is discursive, and one fears that it lacks fundamental unity, that the concern with the place of rhetoric in Renaissance education and the concern with numerous problems in the biography of Milton are not really one and the same. The course of Professor Clark's argument is not always so plain as it might be, partly because he does not resist the temptation to pause upon interesting tangential details, partly because material is sometimes not presented in the best

¹ Harding, *Milton and the Renaissance Ovid* (Urbana, Ill., 1946), p. 39, says 1617; Leach, "Milton as Schoolboy," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, III (1908-9), 296 f., and Clark say 1615.

possible order.² There are a very few badly made sentences,³ and there are a few errors left by proofreader or printer, some of which are repeated in an otherwise adequate index.⁴ The book is well made and provided with end-papers which are useful as well as decorative.

Present-day humanists will leave Professor Clark's book with renewed and angry resentment against a twentieth-century education that has all but abandoned the arts of language and allowed rhetoric to degenerate, among teachers of public speaking, into what the Renaissance called merely *pronuntiatio*. No wonder we are producing no Miltons today.

F MICHAEL KROUSE

University of Cincinnati

The Nonsense of Common-Sense 1737-1738 By Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by ROBERT HALSBAND. Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities No. 17. Evanston, 1947. Pp. xxvii + 57. \$3.00.

This compact small volume contains the text of nine numbers of a series of periodical essays written by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, together with a separate essay from her pen until now unprinted—the whole edited with an introduction and notes. The periodical, *The Nonsense of Common-Sense*, appeared anonymously in London at varying intervals between December 16, 1737, and March 14, 1738, and the essay was written, it seems, several years earlier. Printed copies of all nine issues of the periodical, believed to constitute the entire run, are extant: a batch of five in the Yale University Library, another of eight in the Hope Collection of newspapers in the Bodleian, and one sole issue in the Wortley Papers belonging to the Earl of Harrowby and the Viscount Sandon. Lady Mary's holograph manuscripts for six issues (also for the separate essay) lie among the Wortley Papers, and these manuscripts, as well as the printed versions, Mr. Halsband has examined and collated in the preparation of his book. He believes that no doubt is admissible of Lady Mary's authorship of the three for which no holograph manuscripts exist. And although there is very little in the style and the subject matter of any of these writings to bring

² As on p. 57 ff., where a passage dealing with play breaks in two parts the discussion of rewards and punishments.

³ E.g., p. 70, where the sentence in lines 10-13 lacks unity, p. 76 f., where the author gets tangled in an illogical *but* within a *but* coordination, and p. 191, lines 2 and 3, where there is a tautology.

⁴ P. 79, line 15 *used* for *use*, p. 88, line 30 *Braha* for *Brahe*, p. 126, n. 48 *επιστημη* for *επιστημη*, p. 244, line 19, and p. 267, col. 1 *Sampson* for *Samson*, p. 17, n. 17, p. 24, n. 26, and p. 256, cols. 1 and 2 *Darbyshire* for *Darbyshire*.

to mind the brilliant letter writer, we must believe that she indeed wrote them. For confronting us is the evidence not only of her holograph manuscripts but also of her handwritten admission on the dateline of a printed copy of No. VI, "wrote by me M W M," and the self-ascription at the top of a copy of No. I (at Yale), "all these wrote by M W M to seive an unhappy worthy man."

One issue only of this periodical—No. VI, January 24, 1738—has ever been reprinted in her works, it is rather amazing, in fact, the manuscripts having been accessible to several editors and the printed copies easily available, that only just now are we hearing about them.

Lady Mary's title explains the occasion of the periodical. It made a bid for readers as an answer to the weekly *Common Sense* or the *Englishman's Journal* (February 1737-1743?) at the time chief organ of the Opposition Party. Her paper could never be interpreted, however, as more than lukewarm partizan support of Walpole and the government policies. Although in the relatively few outright or veiled references to political topics she is usually—not always—on the side of the Ministry, her essays are certainly not colored by strong political feeling. "I did not expect to be supported by any party," she wrote, with evident sincerity (Nos. I and V). Whatever the motives for writing and publishing the paper, her emphasis was not that of a party writer but rather of a social moralist with something to say on feminism, class warfare, luxury, and the follies of the *beau monde*. "This was only intended to be a moral paper" (No. V). Reflections upon politics, she declared, are "foreign to the principal Design of my Papers, which are only intended as short Essays of Morality" (No. VII). The "nonsense" which irritated her to the point of action seems to have been non-political, contained in such dreary *Common Sense* papers as the one on feminism of September 10, 1737, and another on that subject of January 14, 1738, to which she made a lively reply (No. VI). Hackneyed treatment of conventional themes is characteristic of *Common Sense*—to such an extent that it is hard to believe with Mr. Halsband that "most of its essays" (p. 1111) were written by its sponsors, Lord Chesterfield and George Lyttelton. The orientation of Lady Mary's periodical, it cannot be denied, was political, and Mr. Halsband has carefully annotated every comment with a political implication, but it seems a mistake to press the political angle very far.

One final word in this connection. Mr. Halsband makes no mention whatever of *Old Common Sense*, a series of papers running concurrently with *Common Sense* but separate from it, which began issuance only shortly before (November 26) Lady Mary's *Nonsense*. The present reviewer has not seen any copies of this journal but would like to know what bearing it had, if any, upon hers.

And what is to be understood by Lady Mary's notation "to serve

an unhappy worthy man" Mr Halsband believes that he may have been the person responsible for editing *The Nonsense*—for collecting the news items and miscellaneous comment that supplemented the essay in each number. But his identity is not known. The editor of her letters, W. Moy Thomas, suggested with no apparent reason that General James Oglethorpe was the projector. Without reaching a conclusion, Mr Halsband considered both Walpole and her old friend Sir Joseph Jekyll as possible candidates. To these conjectures the present reviewer will venture to add the name of John ("Orator") Henley, the clergyman who was attacking the arguments of the anti-Walpole papers in his journal *The Hypo-Doctor* (1730-39). This curious publicist, whose indefatigable pen is attested by a long list of miscellaneous writings, was getting rough treatment at the hands of *Common Sense*. There may have been a significant connection between its paper of December 10, satirizing Henley as "the chief priest of Nonsense" and the opening of Lady Mary's periodical on the 16th. How he was "served" is unfathomable, but he was in trouble (that he was under government subsidy is doubtful) and was mourning the very recent death of his wife. As Mr Halsband notes, Lady Mary was outspoken in denouncing the *Common Sense* paper of December 31 that ridiculed the courtship and marriage of Henley and his deceased wife, a brutal paper even by the standards of those hatchetmen, and was explicit in her warm defence of Henley (No. V). At this time, it will be remembered, Pope and Henley were engaged in a feud—as were Pope and Lady Mary. Although she did not attack Pope directly in these essays, she may have taken satisfaction in defending one of his enemies. One suspects that in 1737-8 her state of mind was restless and disturbed, in about a year, in July 1739, she left her family and began the long and lonely sojourn on the continent.

Lady Mary would have been amused—or chagrined—at our consideration of her "political" essays. For in after years she disavowed any interest in the subject of politics. "I cannot help laughing at my being mistaken for a politician. I have often been so, though I ever thought politics far removed from my sphere. I cannot accuse my self of dabbling in them, even when I heard them talked over in all companies" (1893 edn II, 316). Nor, except for the *Tatler* and *Spectator*, did she have a favorable word for periodical essays: they are good only for those who "cannot spare time from doing nothing" to read anything else, "such gentle readers may be improved by a moral hint, which though repeated over and over from generation to generation, they never heard in their lives" (II, 279).

I have enjoyed reviewing this well-edited and attractive little book and thus having had an excuse for rereading Lady Mary's entertaining letters. Mr Halsband may take pride in having made an addition to the authenticated works of an important eighteenth-

century writer. It is to be hoped that he will continue with other studies of her life and writings

RAE BLANCHARD

Goucher College

Apologue for "Bartholmew Fayre," The Art of Jonson's Comedies

By FRED A. L. TOWNSEND New York and London Modern
Language Association of America, Revolving Fund, Series xv,
1947 Pp 1-x + 101

Ben Jonson's echoes of the precepts of Horace and Aristotle in his dramatic criticism, at least as sixteenth-century commentaries had presented them, would seem to intensify his reputation for being narrowly classical or dogmatically orthodox. As a matter of fact, he just as forcefully demanded freedom for the playwright. Cordatus, for example, "the Authors friend" in the Induction of *Every Man out of his Humour*, argued against "those strict and regular formes, which the nicenesse of a few (who are nothing but forme) would thrust vpon vs" and in favor of "the same licence, or free power, to illustrate and heighten our inuention" as earlier writers had enjoyed. Accepting the sentiments of Cordatus as Jonson's own, Mrs. Townsend presents in her engaging little book an ingenious deduction of those needful laws from which he claimed in the Prologue of *Volpone* not to swerve. Her title, an allusion to Drummond's statement that Jonson had written for *Bartholmew Fayre* an "apologue" that perished in the fire of 1623, fixes attention on a fundamental critical question: since the variety and liberty of *Bartholmew Fayre* violate the conventions of unity, order, and uniformity, so important in the classical creed traditionally ascribed to Jonson, why did he single out this completely unclassical play as the one he should defend?

Mrs. Townsend's answer is that Jonson is not classical in an absolute sense or even in the more elaborate Renaissance sense, and that the lost apology can hardly be regarded as an expression of the dramatist's regret for having truckled to the ill judgment of the groundlings. If these are not, like Dick Deadeye's, altogether revolutionary sentiments, they do constitute a formidable challenge to the authenticity of the classical portrait of the playwright. To support her interpretation, the author gives equal emphasis to unity and variety. When a critic errs by stressing a similarity to classical models which her analysis shows to be a subordinate consideration, she brings into new but convincing prominence the variety of materials worked by Jonson into his plays. When a critic misjudges the playwright because the very multitudinousness of this variety breaks the formal bonds of dramatic structure, she discovers and defines the underlying unity. Traditional commentaries ignore it because it is not a classical unity.

At the end of this fresh appraisal, Mrs. Townsend formulates the thesis that variety and unity are not only equal but interchangeable and that Jonson's genius when he was writing at his best fused the two.

The first task to which the author addresses herself is a survey of criticism from Dryden to Eliot. This naturally lays stress on the beautifully consistent wrong-headedness of Jonson's commentators. Dryden set the fashion of solemn and wearisome repetition of the dramatist's learning and adherence to rules derived from the ancients, together with the stale and misleading contrast with Shakespeare. Even at the time of the full-dress editorial honors conferred by Herford and Simpson, he was still regarded as the staunch assertor of classical tradition. Lovers of Jonson will be grateful to Mrs. Townsend for cutting through irrelevance and contradiction to a juster estimate of his work.

The author devotes sufficient space to one more effort to restore Renaissance words to Renaissance contexts so that the intentions of the playwright and his contemporary reputation emerge with new exactness. To Donne, he alone possessed daring enough to renovate those whom he followed. The age apparently recognized the comic laws which he told Brome he was the first to give his time as Jonson's "own original formulation." Altogether he seemed completely at his ease in a society priding itself on its intellectual pretensions. The critical castigation, which according to Greg he richly deserved, was a dubious honor kept for later times to bestow.

The heart of the book describes what Mrs. Townsend takes to be the evolution of the dramatist's unclassical art. To this end she devotes a series of chapters based on analyses of the individual plays. A logical application of Jonson's restored critical principles, of the needful laws of which he wrote, dictates this theme: that he achieved his final goal when he employed the greatest audacity in amassing sharply contrasted elements. As his skill in construction matured, he shaped these abundant materials into a form very different from the comedy of sharply defined single action. *Volpone*, for example, possessed a unity which is not the unity of action characteristic of classical comedy, but a unity contrived by the thematic center, which rests on the power of money. There is, necessarily, a defense of the fifth act, often maligned as a mere excrescence, and a well-presented explanation of its dramatic propriety. In *Epicoene*, again, the skillful handling of three major intrigues superbly interwoven results in a plot both complicated and unified, an exercise in unity, once more, not of the classical sort. Mrs. Townsend, cautioning against the traditional tendency to equate excellent construction with classical construction, notes that in *The Alchemist* Jonson gave the crowded stage and variety of persons form characterized not by the neat classical unities, but in Swinburne's telling phrase a multitudinous unity of various and discordant elements.

But the high point of the dramatist's art, according to Mrs Townsend, is *Bartholomew Fayre*. This, his most popular play, approximates classical canons more remotely than any other. It is, on the contrary, the successful culmination of experiments in earlier plays with multiplied motives, plots dexterously fused, "sinuous intiguings," thematic transformations, and "centripetal interlacings." Here the constructive skill of Jonson lies, not in the manipulation of plot, but in manipulation without it. He built his comedy not in accordance with the classical principle of simplicity and symmetry, but in accordance with the principle of complexity, he created what Eliot describes as the bewildering chaotic action of the Fall. Mrs Townsend argues persuasively that it is a chaos of the surface only, events fall at last securely into artistic order. The book closes with a reemphasis on the needful laws of Jonson's playwriting: unity, to be sure, but a unity composed of many parts, and a variety that in several ways breaks sharply with tradition.

DANIEL C BOUGHNER

Northwestern University

The Crown of Life: Essays in Interpretation of Shakespeare's Final Plays. By G WILSON KNIGHT. London: Oxford University Press, 1947. Pp viii + 336. \$5 00.

To those who are familiar with the method and matter of Professor Knight's earlier contributions to Shakespearean interpretation, *The Crown of Life* offers nothing novel, nothing strange. But the imaginative unity and continuity of Shakespearean poetry and vision which his previous studies attempt to reconstruct out of the complexity of the problem and tragedy plays, Professor Knight here traces through Shakespeare's final works—*Pericles*, *Winter's Tale*, *Cymbeline*, *The Tempest*, and *Henry VIII*—to a climactic spiritual insight which translates them from the realm of dramatic art into the realm of conscious religious intuition.

With the publication of this volume, which he considers the culmination of his interpretive labors, as well as his "main contribution to Shakespearian studies," Professor Knight's Shakespearean criticism has come full circle. For *The Crown of Life* is actually a detailed development of an earlier outline of his concept of the Shakespearean "myth of immortality." This original essay, *Myth and Miracle* (1929), which contained the first major pronouncement of Professor Knight's "interpretive" method, has been reprinted in its entirety as the first chapter of the present volume. The remaining five chapters of the work present a closely-knit analysis of the imaginative correspondences in language, imagery, character, and episode which characterize the final plays.

For Professor Knight, this terminal sequence of plays represents

Shakespeare's supreme imaginative achievement, in them he transcends the dramatist's narrower function of mimesis—from which he had been gradually freeing himself since *Hamlet*—and becomes the oracle of a poetic eschatology, a mystic vision of romantic immortality, which Professor Knight proposes as a Renaissance equivalent of the deliberate artistic projection of religious vision found in Greek tragedy and *The Divine Comedy*. This unique interpretation is based primarily on the insistence with which the stage device of resurrection and reunion—symbolism of immortality to Professor Knight—occurs in these plays. Marina and Thaisa in *Pericles*, Hermione and Perdita in *Winter's Tale*, Imogen, Arviragus, and Guiderius in *Cymbeline*, and Ferdinand and Alonso in *The Tempest*: all of these characters, Professor Knight points out, are believed dead, only to reappear in reunions which are to be construed as the dramatic objectification of a culminating and mystical Shakespearean wisdom. Often this rebirth, and the accompanying reunion, are surrounded with a semi-mystical, semi-religious dramatic machinery, a "theophany," to use Professor Knight's term. In these episodes, and in the characterization of such holy necromancers as Paulina, Cerimon, and Prospero, Professor Knight discerns Shakespeare's deliberate attempt to realize poetically his insight into the mystery of resurrection. The significance of these correspondences in episode and characterization, he finds corroborated by the language and imagery of these plays. Recurrent poetic suggestion of deity, mysticism, religion, immortality, youth, renewal, fecundity, and sexual and natural fruition underlines and reinforces the central motif expressed in the dramatic rebirths.

Professor Knight's method, relying as it does on a closely-articulated imaginative pattern, necessarily suffers in summary. In general, however, *The Crown of Life* repeats both the virtues and the defects of his earlier works. But it is not likely that it will win many new converts to his "interpretive" approach. Students who welcomed the bold imaginative synthesis of such earlier studies as *The Wheel of Fire* and *The Imperial Theme* will follow much less confidently and much less comfortably Professor Knight's irruption into the more tenuous areas of Shakespearean mysticism. Fortunately, Shakespearean criticism is a spacious empire, with mansions aplenty, and acceptance for every talent. Devotees of the historical and bibliographical approach which has dominated the last generation of Shakespearean studies, to be sure, will ignore *The Crown of Life*, or lustily damn it as incorrigible and meaningless subjectivism, while a faithful minority of Professor Knight's disciples will fervently pursue its pages the other side idolatry. Between these two extremes, however, there will be a large body of neutral readers for whom the volume will offer a scattered wealth of interpretive suggestion and imaginative insight for the plays discussed, and who will assuredly read it with pleasure and profit, if without conviction.

Die Englische Farce im 19 Jahrhundert By WERNER KLEMM
 Bein Verlag A Francke Ag, 1946 Pp viii + 191

This monograph covers much more ground than its title suggests. It is a rather exhaustive study of the nature of farce in general and of English farce in particular. Beginning with an inquiry into the definition of the term, the author traces the evolution of farce as a *genre* with marked characteristics which, while undergoing minor changes in the course of centuries, have nevertheless remained fairly constant. The scope of his researches in English farce is indicated by his consideration of "The Deluge," in the Chester cycle, and Shaw's *Androcles and the Lion*. He notes the farcical elements in many Elizabethan plays, including those of Shakespeare, but somehow misses Marlowe's *Faustus*. A more important omission is the influence of the Italian *commedia dell' arte*, which Dr. Klemm is content to dismiss with a bare mention.

Some of the author's conclusions are debatable. For example, the fact that few of the English farces of the nineteenth century were written by women authors is neither surprising nor significant, since until comparatively recent years, but few women engaged in play-writing of any kind. Nor can the fact that the majority of English farce writers were city bread account for the fun poked at the expense of the country. No one can be more pitiless in exposing rural foibles than natives turned playwrights, just as most of the harshest satirists of city fops were city fops themselves.

The best sections deal with the changing themes of farce and the type of characters it evolved. Here, too, the author might have enriched his study had he chosen to inquire what factors—social, political, psychological—tended to influence the emergence of certain types on the English stage. It is true, of course, that after 1870 we find many farces revolving about the father who is dominated by his children—like Pinero's magistrate who is "too good-natured to say Bo to a goose"—but why? Nevertheless, these two sections are carefully organized and well-documented and make a contribution to the classification of theme and character-type.

The final chapter is a study of Bernard Shaw's farcical devices and word-play. While Shaw is generally given credit as an expounder of ideas, it is frequently overlooked to what extent the entertainment value of his plays is derived from farcical situations, even slap-stick, and farcical wording. Shaw's intention may be deadly serious, but the effect of his treatment is often merely amusing. This paradox has worried Shaw, who has publicly regretted that he has sometimes succeeded in moving an audience to laughter rather than thought and right action. Yet his contribution to farce, as to comedy in general, has been considerable and wholesome. He has proved that ideas can be not only exciting but theatrically amusing as well. Here Dr. Klemm rests his case for the distinctive nature and validity of farce.

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

The Johns Hopkins University

Das Problem der Fragmentarischen Dichtung in der Englischen Romantik By ILSE GUGLER Bern Verlag A Francke Ag, 1944 Pp 89 S Fr 6 (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, No 15).

Dr Gugler attacks the neglected problem, is it possible to find any general reasons why so many notable poems by the Romantics were left unfinished? She considers about seventeen of them, the most important being Wordsworth's *Recluse*, Coleridge's *Christabel*, Byron's *Don Juan*, and Keats's *Hyperion*. She does not neglect the external circumstances which severally helped to cause the incompleteness, but she is chiefly desirous of finding behind the surface-facts some deeper reasons to explain the fragmentariness, something in the personality of the author or in the nature of his ideas and the choice of his medium. In the cases of the four major authors she finds that the reasons are in some points very different. Sometimes the poet undertook a subject which proved uncongenial or intractable, in other cases the chosen myth or form was found unsuitable to convey the main idea or spirit. Dr Gugler believes, however, that she has established one important generalization, namely, that the fragmentariness is due in notable instances to the fact that the Romantics are more interested in the infinite than in the finite, apt therefore to undertake themes which are found difficult to express in satisfying finite forms. The imaginative ambition combined with artistic conscientiousness, caused some of the abandonments. In conclusion she contrasts the English Romantics with the German. To the latter, who were more philosophical, the fact that a poem remained a fragment was not so serious, since all finite creations are defective, whether or not formally concluded. The English, on the other hand, offered no such metaphysical excuses, as a rule, they were distressed whenever they could not finish a poem, and felt that it was because they had attempted to express something so transcendental or delicate or profound that they were unable to bring it to completion in a suitable style and form.

For some time to come we shall be depending chiefly upon Swiss writers for the criticism of English literature in German. It is therefore encouraging to observe in this monograph (as also in the more important case of Fritz Strich's recent *Goethe und Weltliteratur*) that in the Swiss universities there is flourishing an admirable kind of scholarship, combining due respect for facts with the desire to fathom their critical and philosophical meanings.

Laurence Sterne's Sermons of Mr Yorick By LANSING VAN DER
HEYDEN HAMMOND New Haven Yale Univ Press, 1947.
Pp viii + 195 \$3 00

By a thorough investigation of sources, including five hitherto unknown, and by an analysis of parallels in such writers as Tillotson, Hall, Leightonhouse, and Clarke, Mr Hammond illuminates an area of Steine criticism that has suffered in the past from too much generalization and from too little research. This first full study of Yorick's sermons throws light on their order of composition, on the development of "Shandyism," and on the problem of plagiarism, and it offers some interesting conjectures as to Steine's methods. Mr Hammond proposes as a hypothesis—and he supports it well—that Volumes v-vii of the collected sermons, published after Steine's death, were actually written earlier than Volumes i-iv, his maturer work, which Steine himself saw through the press. The argument rests chiefly on internal evidence, but a convincing case is built on a comparative study of the two groups of sermons. One of the strongest evidences—though Mr Hammond says "available evidence is not strong enough to constitute positive proof"—grows out of an analysis of the nature of Steine's borrowings. Mr Hammond notes again and again the artistry, the imagination, and the typical Shandian touches in Volumes i-iv that alchemize the passages Yorick has obviously lifted from his sermonizing contemporaries. We can contrast these transmutations with the borrowed passages in the work, composed earlier though published later, of Volumes v-vii, with their cruder plagiarisms, their less inspired treatment of Scriptural incident, and their relatively colorless handling of sources common to both groups. Though less persuasive than the argument for viewing Volumes v-vii as composed early in Steine's career, Mr Hammond presents some interesting conjectures as to dates of composition. All but one of the collected sermons, he believes, were composed, at least in part, as early as 1751.

This re-ordering and re-dating also involves revaluation. Mr. Hammond feels that the charges of plagiarism so often brought against Sterne—and with so much reason—must be somewhat modified, particularly in the light of the greater leniency of eighteenth century attitudes, and in view of the unlikelihood of wilful deception in borrowings from such well known writers as Tillotson and Clarke. And we must also consider the fact that the most glaring instances are taken more frequently from the volumes Sterne did not see through the press. "Shandyism" too, he feels, must now be viewed as a stylistic development taking place over a longer period of years, with clear hints of it at least ten years before the opening pages of the novel which gave us the term. From his concluding chapter, it is quite clear that Mr Hammond thinks that Mr Yorick, with his sermons "point blank to the heart," deserves a kindlier treatment than has been accorded him in the past.

MARGARET R. GRENNAN

BRIEF MENTION

Dr Campbell's Diary of a Visit to England in 1775 Newly edited from the MS by JAMES L. CLIFFORD Cambridge at the University Press, New York The Macmillan Company, 1947 Pp xvi + 148 \$2 75 Dr Thomas Campbell, an amiable Irish clergyman and antiquarian, kept a journal of his visit to England from February 23 to May 9, 1775 The contents of this journal were first published in 1854 in Sydney, Australia The mystery of the manuscript's journey from Ireland to the antipodes had long ago been satisfactorily solved and the authenticity of the diary is now settled beyond a doubt

Campbell, as Macaulay correctly noted in his *Diary* on May 21, 1859, is no "blind fanatical worshipper of Johnson" Boswell, it will be remembered, gives such an impression of the engaging Irishman in his *Life of Johnson*, asserting that Campbell "had come to England chiefly with a view to see Dr Johnson, for whom he entertained the highest veneration" But even if Boswell were telling the truth about Campbell, the diary does not give us a clergyman's diluted impressions of the literary giant of the latter 18th century Campbell's remarks reinforce our opinion of old Johnson as a vigorous man with a vigorous vocabulary and a vigorous vanity and zest for life

The diary is an entertaining trifle for its firsthand revelations of men and manners and the taste of the times Campbell, for example, was a collector of obscure engravings, "an ardent devotee of the theatre," and an admirer of the picturesque landscape But it is especially valuable for what it adds to the talking picture of Samuel Johnson Although Campbell himself was politically conservative and in later years preached "in opposition to that foolish and wicked doctrine of the equality of men and their rights," he is able to comment shrewdly on Johnson's shockingly vicious ranting about rebels, Irish and American Some of Johnson's opinions, of course, appear elsewhere in somewhat different form

Dr Clifford supplies us with a complete and accurate text to replace the rare but imperfect first Australian edition, and the bowdlerized reprint in the supplementary volume of *Johnsoniana*, edited by Mrs Robina Napier in 1884 The present editor is to be commended for his industry in preparing a careful text of Campbell's unpolished day by day observations and a fine set of accompanying explanatory notes, as well as a definitive biography of the diarist

Fair Rosamond A Study of the Development of a Literary Theme By VIRGIL B. HELTZEL Evanston Northwestern University, 1947 Pp viii + 136 \$3.00 (Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, 16) Professor Heltzel's monograph records in expert fashion the course of the Rosamond story in English literature from Gerald of Barri to John Masefield. It begins with a moralizing on a king's mistress, Rosamond Clifford (d. 1176). With Higden, a century later, it adds the Woodstock labyrinth as mystery element. With the French Chronicle of London it completes the theme with the torture and murder of the mistress by a jealous Queen Eleanor.

From these slender materials the Elizabethans Daniel and Warner developed their Rosamond poems, and were followed by Drayton and May and by the popular ballad of Deloney. No Elizabethan play, curiously enough, used the story, and the ballad kept it alive, seconded by the chap-books which began in 1640. A Restoration play by John Bancroft added political complications to make five acts. It brought in the partisans of Becket, and so began the trend toward the transfer of interest to Becket himself in the later versions, the play by William Henry Ireland, the novels after Scott, and finally the Tennyson play. Addison's opera, not taking the story too seriously, changed to a happy ending, which again came to be preferred, except as Swinburne and Mr. Masefield, in returning to a private rather than a public story, necessarily restored the queen's revenge. A third approach to the theme was the broad burlesque of the extravaganzas of the last century.

Mr. Heltzel's "Retrospect" notes the inventiveness of the authors of these versions, and observes approvingly their usual return to earlier versions for inspiration. He has not conjured up principles of variation, nor has he imagined any dark Freudian motives to account for them. His judgments of literary values might perhaps have been made more explicit, were it not implicit that most of his material is not very valuable as literature. He has rightly preferred to make an historical record which is workmanlike and authoritative.

GEORGE B. PARKS

Queens College

Essays of Shakespeare an arrangement By GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR New York G P Putnam, 1947 Pp xv + 122 \$2.50 Professor Taylor has had the clever idea of arranging poetical statements garnered from the plays of Shakespeare and dealing with single topics as if they were prose essays. There are essays on Time, Truth, Lust, Philosophy, Laughter, Imagination, Ceremony, Death, and other subjects dear to the successors of Bacon. Some of the arrangements give both sides of the question, as those on Drinking and on Knowledge and Ignorance, and we are able to listen to the pros and cons as they occurred to the master. One is also impressed by the ingenious way in which Professor Taylor has smoothed the joint so that one often has the impression that the essays were conceived as organic wholes until the familiar lines turn up and undeceive us. There is a table of references in the back of the volume to lead the reader to the proper spot in the works of W. S.

D C A

CORRESPONDENCE

DIGNITAS in Otfrid, *Ad LIUTBERTUM*. Some time ago Alan J. Ansen commented on a translation of Otfrid, *Ad Liutbertum* by Francis P. Magoun, Jr.¹ He was concerned with the meaning of *dignitas*, which he was "inclined to view as a reference to the official dignity of the archbishop." It is noteworthy that eight centuries later and perhaps also in Otfrid's day *dignitas* refers to a bishop's rank. According to Johann Jacob Hoffmann, *Lexicon universale* (Leiden, 1698),

DIGNITAS, In Ecclesia Romana, *Dignitas* in Ecclesiasticis beneficiis, quando beneficium habet administrationem rerum Ecclesiasticarum cum iurisdictione vel ex eo, quod habet nomen dignitatis cum prærogativa, in Choro & Capitulo denique, quando Constitutio vel Consuetudo Ecclesiæ habet, quod beneficium habeatur & reputetur pro dignitate, Archidice *de Consuet.*, l 6, c 1 apud Car du Fresne. Sed & in eadem Communione notum vulgariter functiones sacras dis tribui, in Ordines & *Dignitates*. Istæ sunt *Episcoporum, Metro politanorum, Archiepiscoporum, Patriarcharum, Cardinalium & Papæ*

Although this definition is much later than Otfrid's dedicatory letter, it seems pertinent to his meaning. Older examples may come to light to establish the usage in Otfrid's day.

ARCHER TAYLOR

University of California, Berkeley

¹ *Modern Language Notes*, 1944, pp. 513-514.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

MARCH, 1949

Number 3

MELVILLE'S USE OF TWO PSEUDO-SCIENCES

While Hawthorne trembled at the power of mesmerism and Poe declaimed that phrenology had "assumed the majesty of a science,"¹ Melville fortunately possessed the perspicacity to measure a little more accurately the true value of two pseudo-scientific systems.

In the middle of the nineteenth century mesmerism was a misunderstood and even dangerous plaything, and psychology was a fledgling science which had wandered into many unscientific by-ways, the popular sciences of the day were phrenology and, in a lesser degree, physiognomy. Melville's critical judgment proved itself sound when he remarked that "all those sallies of ingenuity, having for their end the revelation of human nature on fixed principles, have by the best judges, been excluded with contempt from the ranks of the sciences."² He involved in this condemnation chiefly palmistry, physiognomy, phrenology, and early nineteenth-century psychology.

Yet, while he scoffed at these studies as unscientific, he knew and apparently admired the work of Lavater, was reasonably familiar with Gall and Spurzheim, and alluded frequently to the principles of physiognomy and phrenology in his works.

In *Pierre*, for example, the "very wonderful" book on physiognomy which plays so vital a part in the story is almost certainly

¹ In *The Southern Literary Messenger*, II, 286-287 (March, 1836). Consult the following articles by Edward Hungerford: "Poe and Phrenology," *American Literature*, II, 209-231 (November, 1930), and "Walt Whitman and His Chart of Bumps," *ibid.*, II, 350-384 (January, 1931). See also H. O. Lokensgard, "Oliver Wendell Holmes's 'Phrenological Character,'" *NEQ*, XIII, 711-718 (December, 1940).

² *The Confidence Man*, p. 91. All quotations from Melville's works are from the Constable Edition, London, 1922-24.

a translation of Lavater's eighteenth-century classic.³ That Melville himself owned a copy of the book is attested by its being listed among the titles purchased on his European tour of 1849-1850.⁴ Pierre's father, it will be remembered, was presumed to believe that in it "the strangest and shadowiest rules were laid down for detecting people's innermost secrets by studying their faces" and refused to have his portrait painted lest his own secret be disclosed.⁵

Melville's interest in phrenology and physiognomy began at least as early as 1847, in that year his comic articles on Zachary Taylor, which appeared in the *Yankee Doodle* magazine, made satirical use of phrenological terminology. "Old Zack's" face, Melville remarked in his third article, constituted a "physiognomical phenomenon, which Lavater would have crossed the Atlantic to contemplate."⁶

Two years later, in *Mardi*, he concluded an interesting description of the island kings with the following statement: "[V]arious their features, as the rows of lips, eyes, and ears in John Caspar Lavater's physiognomical charts. Nevertheless, to a king, all their noses were aquiline."⁷ The sly sarcasm of the second sentence is apparent when one recalls that, in Lavater's charts, a nose of aquiline shape indicated power to rule, act, overcome, and destroy.

The proponents of the pseudo-sciences are humorously invoked at

³ *Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beforderung der Menschenkenntnis und Menschenliebe* by Johann Kaspar Lavater (1741-1801) is usually translated as *Essays on Physiognomy*.

⁴ See Herman Melville, *Journal of a Visit to London and the Continent*, ed. Eleanor Melville Metcalf (Cambridge, Mass., 1948), p. 85.

⁵ See *Pierre*, p. 109.

⁶ Melville's articles appeared in the weekly issues from July 24 to September 11, 1847. They are discussed by Luther S. Mansfield in "Melville's Comic Articles on Zachary Taylor," *American Literature*, ix, 411-418 (January, 1938).

But Melville must have been acquainted with phrenology almost from boyhood. Nearly everyone of the time seems to have taken some interest in the subject. Merton Sealts brings to my attention a curious manuscript in the Gansevoort-Lansing Collection of the New York Public Library—a manuscript which purports to be a "reading" by L. N. Fowler of the "character and talents" of Melville's brother-in-law (Hoadley), dated June 24, 1845.

⁷ *Mardi*, I, 294. An abridged edition of Lavater (London, 1806) has seven excellent plates, each containing six illustrations of physiognomical types. On page 61 is a description of the aquiline nose and its revelations.

the temple of Vivenza, in the same book, where Tajū admires the head of Daniel Webster, "one calm grand forehead among those of this mob of chieftains Gall and Spurzheim! saw you ever such a brow?—poised like an avalanche, under the shadow of a forest! woe betide the devoted valleys below! Lavater! behold those lips—like mystic scrolls!"⁸

Comparable to the brow above was Claggart's, in *White-Jacket*, it was, Melville says, "of the sort phrenologically associated with more than average intellect"⁹ Claggart's wickedness, it would seem, lay not in any deficiency of the intellect but rather of the heart In the same novel Melville comes to an astonishing conclusion after examining the bumps of Bland, the disgraced master-at-arms, for he says, "Phrenologically, he was without a soul"¹⁰

Before proceeding to discuss Melville's "reading" of the "talents and character" of the great sperm whale, one may note that the pseudo-sciences have a part in the satire of *The Confidence-Man* The Intelligence-Office manager, wishing to recommend a young boy to the Missourian for employment, has recourse to phrenological evidence of the applicant's fitness

"As for the boy, by a lucky chance, I have a very promising little fellow now in my eye—a very likely little fellow, indeed"

"Honest?"

"As the day is long Might trust him with untold millions Such, at least, were the marginal observations on the phrenological chart of his head, submitted to me by the mother"¹¹

Earlier in the same story, the man with the willow, in attempting to gain the confidence of the melancholy young man, has made use of a knowledge of phrenology to flatter him "Phrenologically, my young friend, you would seem to have a well-developed head, and large, but cribbed within the ugly view, the Tacitus view,

⁸ *Mardi*, II, 227

⁹ *White Jacket*, p 31 Phrenologists believed, with the physiognomists, that a large, high forehead revealed intellectual capacity See, for example, George Combe, *A System of Phrenology* (Boston, 1839), pp 33 34, 433 434

¹⁰ *White-Jacket*, p 234

¹¹ *The Confidence Man*, p 170 Since there does not seem to have been an organ of honesty in the phrenological system, this trait must have been determined indirectly through a study of the organs of secretiveness, conscientiousness, etc

your large brain, like your large ox in the contracted field, will but staive the more" ¹² Very likely the melancholy young man was aware that the Phrenological Society had collected casts representing the skulls of Bruce, Raphael, La Fontaine, and others, and that they all were large, further, that the busts and portraits of Bacon, Shakespeare, and Napoleon indicated large heads ¹³

But it was in *Moby-Dick* that Melville applied his knowledge of the pseudo-sciences most fruitfully Here he subjected the whale to a phrenological and physiognomical examination of some thoroughness The suggestion for such a scrutiny probably came from Cheever ¹⁴

Melville approached his project not with entire certainty

To scan the lines of his face, or feel the bumps of the head of this leviathan, this is a thing which no physiognomist or phrenologist has as yet undertaken Such an enterprise would seem almost as hopeful as for Lavater to have scrutinised the wrinkles on the Rock of Gibraltar, or for Gall to have mounted a ladder and manipulated the dome of the Pantheon Still, in that famous work of his, Lavater not only treats of the various faces of men, but also attentively studies the faces of horses, birds, serpents, and fish,¹⁵ and dwells in detail upon the modifications of expression discernible therein Nor have Gall and his disciple Spurzheim failed to throw out some hints touching the phrenological characteristics of other beings than man Therefore, though I am but ill qualified for a pioneer, in the application of these two semi sciences to the whale, I will do my endeavour ¹⁶

He found that, among its other characteristics, the whale's forehead has "that horizontal, semi-crescentic depression in [its] middle, which, in man, is Lavater's mark of genius" ¹⁷ This is a rather promising beginning, but unfortunately it leads nowhere Directly approached, the whale's head offers too large and rare a puzzle To the physiognomist, says Melville, the whale seems a sphinx, and "to the phrenologist his brain seems that geometrical circle which it is impossible to square" ¹⁸

¹² *The Confidence Man*, pp 32-33

¹³ See Combe, p 527

¹⁴ Henry T Cheever, *The Whale and His Captors* (New York, 1850) Cheever wondered why phrenologists had not made a study of the whale's cranium, pp 156-157

¹⁵ Lavater even studied insects

¹⁶ *Moby-Dick*, II, 80

¹⁷ *Ibid*, II, 83

¹⁸ *Ibid*, II, 84.

The whale's brain, a mere handful in a skull twenty feet long, can hardly be identified, Melville complains. This fact mocks the phrenologist. "It is plain, then," he says, "that phrenologically the head of this leviathan, in the creature's living intact state, is an entire delusion"¹⁹. Nevertheless, a persistent investigator might approach the problem from another perspective.

If you unload his skull of its spermy heaps and then take a rear view of its rear end, which is the high end, you will be struck by its resemblance to the human skull, beheld in the same situation, and from the same point of view. Indeed, place this reversed skull (scaled down to the human magnitude) among a plate of men's skulls, and you would involuntarily confound it with them, and remarking the depressions on one part of its summit, in phrenological phrase you would say—This man had no self esteem and no veneration²⁰.

But since the brain and the skull of the whale are both unsatisfactory subjects for a thorough phrenological examination, Melville proposes a new and ingenious proceeding.

Now, I consider [he says] that the phrenologists have omitted an important thing in not pushing their investigations from the cerebellum through the spinal canal. For I believe that much of a man's character will be found betokened in his backbone. I would rather feel your spine than your skull, whoever you are. A thin joist of a spine never yet upheld a full and noble soul. I rejoice in my spine, as in the firm audacious staff of that flag which I fling half out to the world.

Apply this spinal branch of phrenology to the sperm whale. His cranial cavity is continuous with the first neck vertebra, and in that vertebra the bottom of the spinal canal will measure ten inches across, being eight in height, and of a triangular figure with the base downward. As it passes through the remaining vertebræ the canal tapers in size, but for a considerable distance remains of large capacity. Now, of course, this canal is filled with much the same strangely fibrous substance—the spinal cord—as the brain, and directly communicates with the brain. And what is still more, for many feet after emerging from the brain's cavity, the spinal cord remains of an undecreasing girth, almost equal to that of the brain. Under all these circumstances, would it be unreasonable to survey and map out the whale's spine phrenologically? For, viewed in this light, the wonderful comparative smallness of his brain proper is more than compensated by the wonderful comparative magnitude of his spinal cord.

But leaving this hint to operate as it may with phrenologists, I would merely assume the spinal theory for a moment, in reference to the sperm whale's hump. This august hump, if I mistake not, rises over one of the

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 84

²⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 84-85

large vertebræ, and is, therefore, in some sort, the outer convex mould of it. From its relative situation, then, I should call this high hump the organ of firmness or indomitableness in the sperm whale.²¹

All this, one must own, is a curious mixture of the purest fooling, some reasonably accurate anatomical information, and a shrewd conjecture with relation to the importance of the spinal cord.

These examples will suffice to show Melville's interest in physiognomy and phrenology. It is probably safe to assume that this interest arose out of his deeper concern with human character and conduct, as well as out of his natural appetite for knowledge of all types. The significant thing is that he was not, like others of his time, deceived by the pretensions of these two pseudo-sciences to respectability, but instead recognized the limitations of their methods and theories. His use of the jargon of these two studies added sometimes humor and sometimes irony to his writing, now and again his literary skill in such instances was effective enough to make him appear nearly, but never quite, serious.

TYRUS HILLWAY

New London Junior College

NEW LIGHT ON THE MAUPASSANT FAMILY

The documents given below,¹ published for the first time, throw light on a significant chapter in the history of the Maupassant family. Guy's father, Gustave de Maupassant,² had received for

²¹ *Ibid.*, II, 85-86

¹ From the present writer's collection, in a group of Maupassant letters originally in the collection of the famous bibliophile, Jules Le Petit. These letters constituted lot 2143 in the Le Petit sale of 1918, described as follows in the sale catalogue: "Correspondance de Guy de Maupassant avec M. et Mme Louis Le Poittevin, reunion de trente-trois lettres et billets autographes signes de Guy de Maupassant. Correspondance amicale renfermant de nombreux renseignements interessants sur Guy de Maupassant, sur son frere, la succession de son pere et de sa mere, ses divers deplacements a Etretat, dans le midi de la France et en Italie. On y a joint une lettre interessante de Louis Le Poittevin a Maupassant." These letters were later acquired by the well-known Paris dealer, Pierie Beres, from whom they were subsequently acquired by the present writer.

² Gustave de Maupassant, father of Guy, became a hard-working member of a brokerage firm in Paris after leading a somewhat checkered existence

years an annual allowance of 4000 francs from his own father, Jules de Maupassant,³ of which he contributed 1600 francs to his wife, for the support of their two children, Guy and Hervé⁴ Before his death early in 1875, however, Jules de Maupassant saw his fortune, at one time considerable, reduced to practically nothing. Indeed, his financial situation must have been exceedingly precarious, for in a letter written by Guy to his cousin Louis Le Porttevin, dated September 23, 1874, when Jules de Maupassant was expected to die at any moment, we read the following striking lines "Mon père a reçu une dépêche de Charles Douvre, l'appelant sans retard Il n'a pas voulu s'y rendre, craignant de n'être pas maître de lui-même en pareil moment et de se laisser arracher des promesses qu'il ne voulait pas faire"⁵ Considering the father's financial plight, Gustave de Maupassant was unwilling to accept without reservations a share in his father's estate, for there was the risk of his being obliged to meet claims which might be made against the estate

Further light on this "drame de famille" is provided in a letter by Gustave de Maupassant, written in 1892, at a time when his famous son was completely oblivious to all material preoccupations, since he was then in Dr Blanche's insane asylum at Passy

Il y a trente ans et quelques mois, la vie en commun avec Madame de Maupassant n'étant plus possible nous nous sommes séparés à l'amiable On fit un simple acte sur papier timbre Madame de Maupassant prenait son bien et, en outre, sur la pension de quatre mille francs que me faisait mon père, je lui servais une pension de seize cents francs pour les enfants Une dizaine d'années après, mon père perdit toute sa fortune Ma dot a

as a dashing young man after his marriage to Laure Le Porttevin, sister of Alfred Le Porttevin The Maupassants separated when Guy was about twelve years old Throughout his life, Guy maintained cordial relations with his father After his death, the father took active measures to assure adequate provision from Guy's estate for Simone de Maupassant, the author's niece

³ Jules de Maupassant, paternal grandfather of Guy, was born in Paris and died in Rouen in 1875 He had lived in the capital of Normandy for many years, and as early as 1840 had acquired property at La Neuville, where the Maupassant family became intimate friends of the Le Porttevins

⁴ Cf letter of Gustave de Maupassant to M Jacob, published by Lumbroso, Albert, *Souvenirs sur Maupassant*, Rome, Bocca, 1905, p 476

⁵ *Chroniques, études, correspondance de Guy de Maupassant*, Paris, Grund, 1938, p 202

été supprimée à partir de ce jour, et comme je n'avais pas un sou je suis entré comme deuxième caissier chez Edward Jules, agent de change ⁶

Guy himself had been leading a highly impecunious existence ever since settling in Paris immediately after the Franco-Prussian war. For a while he was enrolled at the law school of the University of Paris, then, with the aid of influential friends of his father's, he succeeded in entering the civil service which he was to leave only after the brilliant success of *Boule de Suif*. For ten years, however, his sensitive nature suffered excruciatingly from the petty economies which his very modest salary imposed on him. Though he sometimes complained bitterly, particularly to his mother and Gustave Flaubert, he was willing to endure any privation while completing his literary apprenticeship under the intransigent eye of the master of Croisset. But once the pendulum of economic fluctuation had swung in his favor, he spent with a lavishness, and at times recklessness, that only his previous years of extreme poverty could explain.⁷

GUY DE MAUPASSANT TO LOUIS LE POITTEVIN

Paris, ce vendredi [March 1875] ⁸

Mon cher Louis,

Mon père, qui est souffrant en ce moment, me charge de te prier de vouloir bien lui faire savoir, aussitôt que tu le pourras, si la succession de mon grand père est enfin acceptée sous bénéfice d'inventaire. Nous avons pris un avoue ici qui craint beaucoup que M. Gauthier, malgré sa dernière lettre dans laquelle il dit qu'il va accepter cette succession sous bénéfice,

⁶ Cf. *op cit* in note 4 above, p. 476. The letter should obviously have been dated 1892 rather than 1902.

⁷ In that connection the poet Auguste Dorchain, a friend of Maupassant, contributes the following hitherto unpublished testimony: "Oui, François était là. Quand il y avait quelque chose à payer, Maupassant lui tendait, sans regarder ni compter, son portefeuille bourré, gonflé, débordant de billets de banque, où ce fidèle serviteur, — fidèle, espérons-le, car il eût pu aisément "faire sa pelote" — puisait sans contrôle. Comme il paraissait être un peu le confident de son maître, nous l'avons surnommé *Scapin*. Simple souvenir classique, molièresque, comme celui qui nous vint tout naturellement à l'esprit lorsque, quelques années plus tard, François publia, — dans la *Revue des Deux Mondes*, s'il vous plaît, — ses *Souvenirs sur les dernières années de son maître*. Et mon valet de chambre est mis dans la gazette" (From a letter to Georges Normandy, now in the present writer's collection).

⁸ Cf. date of Gustave de Maupassant's letter below.

ne finisse par la refuser. La conduite de cet homme étant inexplicable, notre avoué ici nous conseillait même de l'attaquer, prétendant que le fait de réclamer une dette personnelle quand on est chargé de demander le bénéfice d'inventaire pour une succession, entraînant l'obligation, pour l'héritier, s'il payait cette dette, de payer toutes les autres, constituait fraude de la part d'un homme d'affaire.

M. Cullembourg, consulte sur ce que devait coûter le procès verbal fait par Gauthier, évalue le montant des frais à 12 frs au lieu de 140 frs.

Encore une chose. Comme nous ne voulons pas pousser les affaires plus loin avec cet homme, mon père te prie de lui réclamer les lettres de mon grand père et de Mme Cord'homme⁹ à mon père, qu'il lui a envoyées. Ces lettres étant d'une importance capitale, nous serions désolés si elles dis paraissaient.

Tu serais bien gentil de me répondre le plus tôt possible.

Je t'embrasse ¹⁰

Joseph Prunier ¹¹

Mille compliments à ta femme et à ton beau père

Paris, ce mardi

Mon cher Louis,

Si je ne t'ai pas répondu plus tôt, c'est que j'ai passé la journée d'hier à consulter notaires et avocats, et maintenant que ces messieurs m'ont répondu—je puis te dire—Ton M. Gauthier est un fripon.

Le susdit Monsieur, après m'avoir dit devant toi qu'il croyait que mon grand-père ne laissait aucune dette a écrit hier à mon père pour réclamer 90 frs que mon grand père lui devait à lui Gauthier, plus 140 frs pour menus frais. Or la succession n'est pas encore acceptée par lui, au nom de mon père. La dessus, trouvant que cette conduite était loin d'être claire, j'ai été consulter un avocat et voici ce qu'il m'a répondu—

“L'homme qui a fait cela est un fripon et vous n'avez qu'à annuler immédiatement la procuration qu'il a eue les mains. Il est inconcevable qu'un homme d'affaires charge d'accepter une succession sous bénéfice d'inventaire essaye de se faire payer une dette a lui, avant l'acceptation. Il essaye d'entraîner votre père dans l'acceptation pure et simple. Car si cette dette était payée, M. de Maupassant se trouverait engagé par là à payer toutes les autres qui pourraient se présenter. C'est un acte de friponnerie et d'audace inqualifiable pour un légiste. De plus, un homme d'affaire liquidant une succession, qui vient réclamer une dette sous cette rubrique (90 frs dus à l'occasion de la vente de La Neuville¹²) sans autre justification, mais il faudrait qu'un héritier fut stupide pour payer une dette aussi peu motivée. Quant aux frais de succession, cela se borne, d'après les lettres

⁹ Presumably mother of Charles Cord'homme, Louis' step-father.

¹⁰ The next word is illegible, and the rest of the sentence contains one of those unprintable gauloiseries in which Maupassant and his friends frequently indulged.

¹¹ One of several pseudonyms used by Maupassant.

¹² Where Jules de Maupassant had owned property.

mêmes de M Gauthier, à un procès verbal tenant lieu d'inventaire Cela ne peut pas coûter plus de 20 à 30 frs "

Le soir, j'ai été trouver M Fontaine¹³ et lui ai montré les lettres de M Gauthier M Fontaine était indigné Il m'a dit, "Cet homme serait un notaire, il y en aurait assez pour le faire casser Car cette dette payée, M de Maupassant se trouve forcé de payer tout et il détruit par là les sûretés fournies par le bénéfice d'inventaire" Il ne comprend rien non plus aux 140 frs de frais qu'il réclame, et il m'a dit d'écrire *de suite de suite (sic)* à M Cullembourg pour faire annuler la procuration de mon père, ce que j'ai fait, M Fontaine étant persuadé que M Gauthier est l'agent des Cord'homme,¹⁴ tant cette manière d'agir lui paraît extraordinaire

Quand j'ai raconté cela à Robert la Tôque,¹⁵ il s'est mis à rire et m'a dit, C'est cela qui ne m'étonne pas Il y a longtemps que j'avais entendu parler du petit Gauthier comme d'un fripon

Maintenant au tableau Je te trouve plaisant!¹⁶ Je te trouve réussi!¹⁷ Je te trouve
 Je te trouve¹⁸ Comment, j'ai ma chambre encombrée d'horreurs Un sacré caïman¹⁹ que j'ai été obligé de suspendre à mon plafond ne sachant où le mettre et qui fait se foutre de moi toutes les personnes que je reçois, des arêtes de poisson²⁰ que je suis obligé de mettre sur mon lit le jour et sur un fauteuil la nuit Et tu viens me menacer de mettre un tableau de *Bellangé* au mont de piété quand tu possèdes une maison entière!!!!!!!!

Rouennais! Rouennais! Rouennais! Eh nom de dieu de bougre²¹ ne peux-tu le monter dans une chambre supérieure Je vais brûler ton fusil à rouet, manger ton caïman et faire de l'extrait de Lubig avec l'arête d'espardon²²

Or, ouïs ceci—

Cherche un emballer et dis moi vite ce que cela peut coûter de faire emballer cette croute que je prendrai en allant à Etretat²³

¹³ Presumably father of Guy's close friend, Léon Fontaine, familiarly known as "Petit Bleu"

¹⁴ "Après le décès de sa femme M Jules de Maupassant alla habiter à Rouen, rue des Iroquois, 23, la maison de commerce de vins de la famille Cord'homme" (Cf Dumesnil, René, *Guy de Maupassant*, Paris, Tallandier, 1947, note on p 77) The inference is inevitable that Jules de Maupassant owed the Cord'hommes some debts and that the latter were trying to make Gustave de Maupassant assume responsibility for them

¹⁵ Robert Pinchon, another of Guy's intimate friends

¹⁶ Another unprintable word

¹⁷ Cf note 20 below

¹⁸ *Ibid*

¹⁹ Several unprintable words

²⁰ The acquisition of these articles is related by Maupassant in prose, verse, and illustrations of the most comic vein in a letter to Louis Le Poittevin dated February 20, 1875 (reproduced in *op cit* in note 5 above, pp 204-5)

²¹ Where Guy's mother had a villa, "Les Vergues" Louis Le Poittevin was in Rouen

Mais trouve un emballer plus honnête que tes hommes d'affaires

22

A toi

Joseph Prunier

Mille compliments à ta femme et à ton beau pere

GUSTAVE DE MAUPASSANT TO LOUIS LE POITTEVIN

[Paris], ce 15 mars 75 ²³

Mon cher Louis,

Presente toi chez M Gautier [*sic*] avec cette lettre et réclame-lui ma procuration M Gautier devait accepter la succession de mon pere sous bénéfice d'inventaire et il n'a encore rien fait

Il devait savoir que la premiere chose dans une acceptation de succession sous benefice d'inventaire, c'est de ne pas faire *acte d'héritier* et la première chose qu'il fait c'est de m'engager à lui payer une prétendue dette de mon pere, c'est a dire à faire precisement acte d'héritier Ensuite il me reclame une somme insensée pour pouvoir accepter cette succession, apres m'avoir écrit que cette acceptation a une simple conversation avec le juge de paix Du reste, j'ai été mis au courant Cela *coûte 12 francs*, sur lesquels il y a *trois francs pour l'avoué* En presence de ces faits, je viens te prier de retirer ma procuration, et tu me la renverras ensuite

Je te prierai de passer après chez M Cullembourg pour le prevenir que la procuration est retiree et pour le prier d'agir dans le plus bref délai

J'embrasse Lucie et je te serre bien affectueusement la main

G (ustave) de Maupassant

J'ai retrouve les deux lettres que je reclamais Je n'avais envoyé que la copie Il n'y a donc rien à réclamer en fait de lettres Tu peux communiquer ma lettre à M Gautier

J'autorise Monsieur Louis le (*sic*) Poittevin, mon neveu, a reprendre chez Monsieur Gautier, demeurant 50 rue Beauvoisin, une procuration que je lui avais donnee pour accepter la succession de mon pere sous benefice d'inventaire

Paris, ce 15 mars 75

G de Maupassant

ARTINE ARTINIAN

Band College

²² One line of *gauloiserie* omitted

²³ This letter is accompanied by its original envelope, addressed to "Monsieur Louis le Poittevin, rue de Crosne, Rouen, S Inférieure" The envelope bears a legible Paris postmark with a March 15, 1875 date

STANZA THREE OF PAUL VALÉRY'S "CIMETIÈRE
MARIN"

S Johansen writes

La strophe suivante du *Cimetière marin* est dans le même genre que la strophe citée de *La Pythie*, toutes les métaphores de cette strophe doivent décrire la mer

Stable trésor, temple simple à Minerve,
Masse de calme, et visible réserve,
Eau sourcilieuse, Œil qui gardes en toi
Tant de sommeil sous un voile de flamme,
O mon silence! Edifice dans l'âme
Mais comble d'or aux mille tuiles, Toit'

Huit métaphores accumulées dans six vers et se terminant par l'horrible cacophonie "mille tuiles, Toit" ¹

A close reading of the stanza does not in my opinion confirm this drumhead condemnation

Stanza one has presented the sea at midday, rewarding object of vision when thought is over. Stanza two, the shimmering sea appears to embody deepest peace, and with the sun is representative of eternity. To be absorbed in its contemplation is most authentically to know.

Stable trésor, temple simple à Minerve,

with this beginning the third stanza evokes the sea's depths and wealth of potentialities, whereas the first two had not sought to penetrate a glittering surface. Amidst the sacred store the goddess of wisdom may easily find her way, not so others. This interpretation is rhythmically superior and preferable also in meaning to that which makes of the sea a simple edifice consecrated to the goddess "Minerve," linking up with "savoir," last word of the previous stanza, begins, too, a series of images which end in revelation.

Masse de calme, et visible réserve,

paradoxically, since mass is a property of material things and calmness a quality. In the second epithet, the bond and the con-

¹ Svend Johansen, *Le Symbolisme, Etude sur le style des symbolistes français*, Copenhagen, Einar Munksgaard, 1945, p. 113

trast between unseen depths and the surface alone visible are expressed with the greatest concentration of means

The following line continues to evoke seen and unseen

Eau sourcilleuse, Œil qui gardes en toi

except that the novelty introduced, or reached along the image-chain, is a *seeing* as well as a *seen*. The "eyebrowed water", if so endowed, then also possessing an Eye, whose capital letter both personifies, and symbolises the awe-arousing monstrousness of the sea thus intuited as a Cyclopean eye. Stanza three, it may be noted here, is the first to be written in the second person. Its vocative forcefulness is strengthened by a rhythmic device. In the three opening lines there are no fewer than five feet of one syllable, made up by the first or only syllable of *Stable, temple, Masse, Eau, Œil*.

The personification begun in the previous line is continued

Tant de sommeil sous un voile de flamme

by this identification of the sea's unrealised possibilities with slumber, a slumber strangely hidden under a fiery veil, and line five records the shock of revelation. All invocations of an external reality, all hold also for, are identical with the poet's consciousness: the treasure, the temple is within.

O mon silence! Edifice dans l'âme

—and exemplifying the circularity so often found in poems, the poet ends the stanza with a wondering return to contemplate the vision outside, which at the same time magically is his innermost self.

Mais comble d'or aux mille tuiles, Toit!

His fascination renewed, he has expanded the image of the sea which begins and will round off the poem, the sea as a roof, split up—yet not split—into uncounted gleaming tiles.

Can we agree with Johansen that they are cacophonous? Yes, if they are cut down to "aux mil' tuil's, Toit," but not when each syllable is given its due. The following curious remark by a French writer may be accounted for in the same way.

Dans le premier poème que j'aie lu de Valéry — par hasard et ignorant tout de lui, jusqu'à son nom — il y a des vers qui me rendent malade

*Patience, patience,
Patience dans l'azur*

C'est presque aussi douloureux — non, pourtant! — que l'horrible chose par ou débute l'*Art poétique* de Boileau ²

Shorn respectively of three and of two of their syllables, these two lines trot inelegantly along

What, to sum up, has Valéry done in this third stanza? He has taken a banal comparison, the sea and consciousness, and revived it, for it has been freshly experienced. Nor are we placed merely before the brute fact of the experience true to his interests in the dawning, the not yet born, Valéry relives the stages by which, along a chain of associated images, the insight is naively won. These "difficult" verses represent the most primitive form of thought, and find, as though accidentally and to the poet's own astonishment, that the chain once ended establishes an identity. His attitude has not been that of a narrator or of a logician. Face to face with the object of his experience, he has treated it as a living thing and has called it by name. More directly than did the wanderer who discovered that "the footprint in the sand" was his own, he has come to see himself in the external (in other poems he uses the Narcissus motif, or finds intelligence symbolised by a pomegranate). The grammatical structure of the stanza is equally primitive. Although divided by punctuation into two sentences, there is only one verb, and that in a subordinate clause. Through a series of syntactically unrelated epithets, "the poet of the intelligence" expresses what for some is the definitive revelation, Brahman as Atman, ultimate object and ultimate subject as one.

Valéry was not, however, a promulgator of Oriental doctrines. His sense of the fusion between sea and consciousness, never widened to embrace other experienceable things, occupies the poem's third stanza, not the last. In later verses he succumbs to the "temptation of the Occident," as Malraux has called it, falling away from the intuition of oneness, a prey to anguish before the chasm known, in a rational, reflective, conceptualized act of judgment, to separate the solid world that confronts us ("En soi se pense et convient à soi-même") from human subjectivity's nostalgic void ("O pour moi seul, à moi seul, en moi-même . . . J'attends l'écho de ma grandeur interne . . . Sonnant dans l'âme un creux toujours futur!") — an impasse from which escape can be found only in

² H. Bremond, *La Poésie pure*, Paris, Grasset, 1926, p. 85

action, by intimate contact with, struggle against, emergence from the element which hitherto the poet has contemplated passively

Une fraîcheur, de la mer exhalée,
Me rend mon âme O puissance salee!
Couions à l'onde en rejaillir vivant!

KENNETH N DOUGLAS

Yale University

ELIE LUZAC'S REFUTATION OF LA METTRIE

L'Homme plus que machine appeared anonymously in 1748, the same year as La Mettrie's *L'Homme machine*, and was a point-by-point refutation of the latter's scandalizing materialism. Until the turn of the present century, it was generally considered to be the attempt made by Elie Luzac, the publisher of *L'Homme machine*, to clear himself of the imputation of materialist sympathies. Only once was it included, for reasons unknown, with La Mettrie's writings, in the *Œuvres philosophiques* of 1774, not in the final complete edition of 1796. In the next century, the *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes* of Barbier must simply have followed the prevailing opinion when, without decisive comment, it attributed *L'Homme plus que machine* to Luzac. Since 1900, however, its authorship has been a point of controversy. J. E. Poritzky's discovery of several significant statements contemporary with the book's appearance, caused him to ascribe it to La Mettrie.¹ His conclusion was commonly accepted by scholars of eighteenth-century materialism, including R. Boissier in his comprehensive study of La Mettrie.² Contrary to this view, the authorship of Luzac has been defended, exclusively on the weight of "internal evidence," in Hester Hastings' recent analysis of notions of "animal intelligence" in the book.³ But, for lack of factually decisive informa-

¹ J. E. Poritzky, *J. O. de Lamettrie, sein Leben und seine Werke* (Berlin, 1900). The principal source given is an item in the *Goettingische Zeitungen von gelehrten Sachen* (30 Mai 1748) attributing the work to La Mettrie on the basis of "reliable reports" [*nach zuverlässigen Nachrichten*].

² Raymond Boissier, *La Mettrie, médecin, pamphlétaire et philosophe* (Paris, 1931), p. 168. E. Bergmann had also followed Poritzky in *Die Satiren des Herrn Maschine* (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 25-26.

³ Hester Hastings, "Did La Mettrie write *L'Homme plus que machine*?"

tion, neither side has thus far succeeded in proving its attribution. It is now possible to re-examine this issue in the light of fresh and conclusive evidence, Elie Luzac's own acknowledgment that the book was of his composition.

None of the participants in the above controversy has been aware of a fact that alters completely the problem before us. Nowhere has mention been made of the second edition of *L'Homme plus que machine*, dated 1755 and printed privately in Goettingen by the author, Elie Luzac.⁴ This volume, now *raissime*, was probably issued in limited number. That it should have eluded so much persistent effort to determine the authorship of *L'Homme plus que machine* is not surprising, since it is not mentioned among Luzac's works in standard bibliographical sources.⁵ The *Avertissement* accompanying this edition makes entirely clear that the work is Luzac's own and suggests, incidentally, the reasons for its reprinting. Having left Holland owing to difficulties incurred by the publication of *L'Homme machine*, Luzac had retired to a very modest life in Goettingen. His friends seem to have urged a re-publication of *L'Homme plus que machine* as a means of earning money. "J'en donne une nouvelle édition uniquement, parceque mes Correspondans me le demandent, & que le commerce veut, que l'on imprime ce qui se consomme." It may be noted, in passing, that Luzac at the time regarded his refutation of La Mettrie as possessing certain defects. Thinking it, however, an effective enough dose against the temptation of materialist ideas, he made no revisions.

The 1755 edition of *L'Homme plus que machine*, then, establishes Luzac's authorship. It is extremely unlikely, moreover, that Luzac falsely attributed the work to himself. Where would the falsification have been more detectable than in Goettingen, where

PMLA, LI (June, 1936), pp. 440-448. See also Valkhoff, "Elie Luzac," *Neophilologus*, 1919, pp. 10-21, 106-113, for additional "internal evidence" of Luzac's authorship.

⁴ *L'Homme plus que machine*. Ouvrage qui sert à réfuter les principaux argumens, sur lesquels on fonde le Matérialisme par Elie Luzac, Fils. Seconde Edition. Gottingue, chez l'Auteur. 1755. In-12. I am indebted to the valuable Vignaud Collection of the Library of the University of Michigan for the use of this precious volume.

⁵ There is no trace of it in any of the following: Quérard, *La France littéraire*, *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, Michaud, *Biographie universelle*, Haag, *La France protestante*.

Poitzky's source had several years earlier ascribed the book to La Mettrie "according to reliable reports"? Nor would such an irregularity have passed without comment of some kind in the eighteenth century if, with La Mettrie dead since 1751 and the need for secrecy gone, well-informed persons had known for a fact that the French philosopher was the real author. In the total absence of evidence to the contrary, then, the edition of 1755 must be accepted as both unfalsified and authentic, and, given the information it offers, there remains no reason whatever for thinking that Elie Luzac was not its author.

ARAM VARTANIAN

University of Michigan

ONCE MORE, *Durendal*

In 1936, Professor Gerhard Rohlfs published an article in *Archiv*,¹ in which after reviewing all known factual information pertinent to the subject, he sought to prove that the name of Roland's famous sword, *Durendal* (variants *Durendart*, *Durandart*, etc.) derived from O F *dur* + *ent* (< *inde*) + *art* (3d sg pr ind of O F *ardre*, 'to burn,' 'to flame'). Though this etymology seems ingenious, and at first glance, rather convincing, it rests on the primary postulate that the forms of the name ending in *-art* are more primitive and thus of greater authority than the *Durendal* of the Oxford *Roland*. That is, Professor Rohlfs is not disposed to allow the authority of the Oxford *Roland* in this respect to extend farther back than the date of *O* (1150, according to him), despite the fact that although the word, *Durendal*, occurs frequently in *O*, it is always spelled the same. Thus to the MHG version of *circa* 1130 (?) is attributed more authority by R. than he concedes to the Oxford *Roland*! Still another objection is to be raised. If the etymon is O Fr, it would have been unnecessary to explain it to near-contemporaries, for it would have been just as intelligible to them as the names of the other five swords mentioned in the work (*Hauteclere*, *Jorose*, *Preciose*, *Almace*, and *Murglais*), none of which, to my knowledge, called forth a mediaeval gloss, although

¹ "Was bedeutet der Schwertname *Durendal*?", *Archiv* CIX (1936), 57-64.

the last two evoke discussion from modern scholars. But as Rohlf himself shows,² attempts to explain the meaning of *Durendal* began with the *Pseudo-Turpin* and continued thereafter. Thus the probabilities are that the name was not French. At all events, R's article constitutes a thorough bibliographical exposé of the research done on this problem before 1936, and of its fundamental backgrounds.

In 1939, Professor Leo Spitzer had already challenged Rohlf's conclusions on other grounds: notably, that *dur end' ant* was far-fetched, bookish, and inadequately attested.³ In his article Professor S. proposed instead an onomatopoeic variant of *'dreindal*, but in the following year he withdrew his proposal⁴ in favor of the suggestion of A. Dauzat,⁵ who had argued for a compound of the personal name, *Durand*, implying 'constancy.'

Although D's argument (*post* Spitzer) implying that the suffix *-al* with respect to the personal name, *Durand*, functioned similarly to the feminine ending given to the personal name, *Flaubert* (thus converting it into the sword name, *Floberge*) is a cogent one, one serious objection occurs to me. This objection is based partly on Professor Spitzer's own remark in his original article. He says: "The sensationalism of the *Chanson de Roland* is of a rather naive sort: in *esteminals*—a rather rare Latin word was used to produce the effect of *exoticism*, by *Durendal*, an onomatopoeic word somewhat travestied, *shivers of admiration and horror* were probably produced."⁷ But what exotic effect, or what shivers could possibly be produced by a name as common as *Durand*, already attested in Latin form during the Carolingian period?⁸ Even though it may have come to mean 'constancy' or 'endurance' in Italy,⁹ it would most certainly seem incongruously prosaic in comparison with such names as *Hauteclere* and *Jorose*, which of necessity the name of Roland's sword should eclipse in exotic effect. Therefore I have continued to seek another explanation of the name, which I herewith present.

² *Ibid.*, 57-58.

³ *Lang.* xv (1939), 48-50.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xvi (1940), 213-214.

⁵ In a short note in *Le français moderne*, vii, 375, reproduced by S., *loc. cit.*, 213.

⁶ *Lang.* xv, 49.

⁷ Italics, except in conventional cases, are mine.

⁸ Cf. Dauzat, *Les Noms de famille de France* (Paris, Payot, 1945), p. 18.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*

As every one knows, the famous passage in Eginhard speaks of Roland as being "Brittanici limitis praefectus" or 'prefect of the Breton frontier' Though the word 'Breton' may have connoted at this time much that was geographically and linguistically non-Breton (perhaps Norman), there is, on the other hand, no good reason why the late eleventh-century author of *O*, on reading Eginhard as a preliminary to his task, should not have assumed that Roland was of Brittany and accordingly bestowed on the latter's sword a Breton name Let us now advert to the explanation of the *Pseudo-Turpin* "*Durrenda interpretantur durum ictum cum ea dans, quae frangi nullo modo poterat, prius defeciet brachium, quam spata*"¹⁰ Mention is also made here of the sword's incomparable sharpness, inflexible strength, and very great brightness Therefore, I suggest that *Durendal* derives from Breton *duren dall*, 'blade (*duren*) dulls cutting edge' (1 e, of another weapon), or 'blade blinds' (because of its great brilliance) *Duren* is defined by Le Gonidec as 'un morceau, une lame d'acier, le tranchant d'un outil', *dalla*, inf, of which *dall* is 3d sg pr ind, as 'aveugler, émousser, ôter la pointe ou le tranchant à un instrument'¹¹

I suggest further that this name, on the lips of an eleventh-century Basque or Gascon of the Pyrenean region,¹² could most easily have suffered the change of its *i* to *u*,¹³ and in Provençal territory in general, of its *-al* suffix to *-art*¹⁴ in the case of the variant forms Of course, *dur*, connoting a quality essential to a good sword, might in any event have been expected to impinge on *dir*- and to supplant it rather quickly in this case And despite my

¹⁰ Ed of Ciampi, cap xxiii, quoted by Rohlf's

¹¹ *Dictionnaire breton français* (2 vols, St Brieuc, 1850)

¹² For the relevance of this reference to Basque, cf E B Place, "Problems in the Oxford *Roland*," *PMLA* lxxii (1947), 875

¹³ Cf R M Azkue, *Dictionnaire basque espagnol français* (2 vols, Bilbao, Paris, 1905 1906), II, 346, where he states "La *u* se cambia en *i* y vice-versa aun fuera de casos de aglutinación Este fenómeno no obedece a pauta alguna" Among the examples given are *izu* (Biscayan, Guipuzcoan)—*izi* (Upper Navarrese, Lower Navarrese, Labourdin, Roncalais, Souletin), 'fright', *ikutu* (B, G)—*ukitu* (UN, LN, L), 'to touch,' etc (*tocar*), *ume* (R)—*ime* (B), 'child', *utsu* (R)—*itsu* (UN, LN, R), 'blind'

¹⁴ Cf E L Adams, *Word-Formation in Provençal* (New York, McMillan, 1913), pp 67, 138-139, 287, for an account of these suffixes To save space I omit mention of various special treatises for particular areas

strictures presented above, there would also presumably have been present the *analogical* influence of that very old personal name, Lat *Durandus*, Fr *Durand(-t)*, Pr *Duran*,¹⁵ to account for the frequent presence of *a* in the second syllable (*Durandal*, etc.)

EDWIN B. PLACE

Northwestern University

L'EMPLOI DU MOT *DESPORE*
DANS *AUCASSIN ET NICOLETTE*

Le second vers de la première laisse d'*Aucassin et Nicolette* était une pierre d'achoppement pour tous les commentateurs malgré les nombreuses tentatives faites pour l'éclaircir depuis deux siècles. La leçon du vers n'est plus contestable mais aucune interprétation n'a obtenu l'adhésion de tous les critiques. On peut lire un court exposé de ces hypothèses aux pages 41 et 42 de l'édition que Mario Roques a donnée dans les *Classiques français du moyen âge* en 1925 et encore en 1929. Il faut y suppléer par son commentaire détaillé, qui a paru dans *Romana*, LVIII (1932), pp 447-450. On a refusé à plusieurs reprises d'accepter des conjectures telle que celle de J. K. Williams, *Mod Lang Rev*, XXVII (1932), pp 62-63, qui se fonde sur une fausse leçon, mais on doit prendre au sérieux les observations de F. Neri, *Atti della Reale Accademia delle scienze di Torino*, LXVI (1931), pp 195-198. Neri sent une certaine gêne dans l'emploi du couple *viel antef* avec valeur de substantif. Il propose de le rapporter à *deport* avec valeur d'adjectif. "Che il diporto a cui il poeta d'*Aucassin* invita i suoi uditori sia di quel vecchio antico, di quello d'un tempo lontano, non soltanto si spiega con le allusioni consimili d'altre canzoni e racconti, ma s'accorda con quel carattere ingenuo, proprio delle vecchie favole, a cui le prose ed i versi alternati d'*Aucassin* danno un risalto." En effet, une telle interprétation s'accorderait fort bien avec l'allure dramatique de la chantefable. Cependant on peut voir un surnom à deux éléments dans *viel antef*, un seul élément ayant une valeur substantive et l'autre servant à le qualifier.

¹⁵ Dauzat, *op cit* in Note 6, gives *passim* a rather full treatment to the history of this personal name.

Cette formule était censée désigner le jongleur ou l'auteur lui-même ou son modèle ancien. Tant s'en faut ! Il n'y a aucune énigme autobiographique. Le *viel antif*, c'est un des protagonistes, le vieux père d'Aucassin dont les deux adolescents doivent contre-carrer la volonté. Leo Spitzer vient de nous le dire dans *Mod Phil*, XLV (1947), pp. 8-14. Il considère le *viel antif* comme une locution renforcée par tautologie. Il ajoute que ce trait est un procédé de rhétorique dont le poète a fait largement usage et qui était courant dans la poésie française du moyen âge. A mon avis cette explication emporte la conviction. Elle m'impressionne d'autant plus que M. Spitzer y est parvenu indépendamment de Vincenzo Crescini. Cette étude précieuse, "Per l'esordio della cantafavola su Aucassin e Nicoletta," dont je dois la connaissance à Neri, a paru dans *Studi dedicati a Francesco Torraca* (Naples, 1912), pp. 381-387.

Cela posé, il reste à déterminer le sens de *deport* dans ce vers. Jusqu'ici la plupart des critiques ont attribué l'idée de "plaisir, amusement" à *deport*, ce qui rendait nécessaire l'identification du *viel antif* avec un personnage situé en dehors de la chantefable. Si on consulte les grands dictionnaires du vieux français, on aura l'embarras du choix dans les nuances du mot. A la page 147 de son édition du *Roman du Hain*, Albert Henry a démontré que dans ce poème Sarrasin a employé *deport* dans quatre vers avec les sens de "plaisir amoureux, joie, retard, ménagement," et qu'il a employé *deporter* dans quatre autres vers avec les sens de "se divertir, passer sous silence, renoncer à, se comporter." Ce dernier emploi est à retenir ici à côté de cinq exemples semblables dans Tobler-Lommatszsch, dont les deux passages sont reproduits textuellement par Spitzer, dans Godefroy, Compl. IX p. 306c, dans La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, V p. 73b, dans *Le Vair Palefrier* 828.

Grâce au renvoi de Neri, on apprend que Crescini avait réussi à identifier le vieillard décrépît comme le comte Garin de Beaucaire et aussi qu'il avait précisé le sens du mot *deport* par "diportamento, condotta." De son côté Spitzer a conclu que *deport* est employé dans la chantefable au sens de "manière de se comporter, conduite, attitude," mais qu'aucun lexicographe n'a relevé cet emploi ailleurs en vieux français. Il cite un texte anglais de 1474 et il justifie l'hypothèse du NED. Il ajoute que *deportes* se trouve dans le voisinage de *countenance* et que Caxton voulait y décrire la "manière" d'une dame. Néanmoins dans ce contexte il faut pren-

dre l'idée, non pas au sens moral comme dans *Aucassin et Nicolette*, mais au sens physique Spitzer a attiré l'attention aussi sur un passage que Godefroy a tiré de la *Somme le Roi*, qui accouple *deport* et *contenance* Godefroy a beau l'enregistrer sous la rubrique "joie, plaisir," on voit que dès 1279 Laurent d'Orléans a dû employer *deport* au sens moral de "conduite" Plus tard le mot a été employé dans ce sens par Charles d'Orléans dans ses poésies d'après l'édition de Champion, II p 650 J'ignore la source de la définition "attitude, état" que Bos a attribuée à *deport* dans son *Glossaire de la langue d'oïl* Peut-être le *Roman de la Rose* 13322

On peut rapprocher cet emploi de *deport* au sens moral de l'apax *deporte* découvert par Godefroy dans une lettre de Charles IX aux consuls d'Agen en l'an 1570 et de *deportement* cité par Tobler-Lommatzsch dans *Les quatre âges de l'homme* Dans cette œuvre Philippe de Novare a accouplé le mot à *contenance* quatorze années avant Laurent d'Orléans Les exemples de *déportements* au sens moral pullulent, surtout au 16^e et au 17^e siècle Godefroy, Compl IX p 306c, en cite quatre, Livet, *Lexique de la langue de Molière*, II p 52, qui estime que le mot a paru pour la première fois en 1596 chez Odet de la Noue, le signale chez huit écrivains

Donc rien ne nous empêche plus d'affirmer que l'interprétation littéraire, qui explique le début de la chantefable comme une allusion à la conduite du vieux comte, satisfait toutes les exigences des paléographes et des psychologues qui s'intéressent à la France médiévale.

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

RIISING TO CHRIST ON THE CROSS

(*PARADISO*, XI, 70-72)

In this passage praising Lady Poverty, the bride of St Francis,

Ne valse esser costante, nè feroce,
Sì che, dove Maria rimase giuso,
Ella con Cristo salse in su la croce

several 14th century manuscripts have the reading, for the last verse,

Ella con Cristo pianse in su la croce

Many modern editors, under the influence of the esthetic criticism of men such as Cesari or Tommaseo, have preferred and still prefer this version, in spite of the fact that Giovanni Mestica,¹ Alessandro d'Ancona² and Alberto Bertoldi³ have emphatically opposed it, arguing that *piangere* weakens the dominant idea, i.e. the contrast between Mary standing below and Poverty ascending with Christ upon the Cross. Mestica and d'Ancona discovered also that this contrast has been a favourite motif in early Franciscan literature, though he quoted a prayer attributed to St Francis, the *Oratio beati Patris ad obtinendam Paupertatem*, reproduced by Ubertino da Casale in his *Arbor vitae crucifixe*,⁴ where the same contrast between the Virgin and Lady Poverty is described, with emphasis upon the *altitudo crucis* which prevents the Virgin, but not Poverty, from following Christ in his last trial. Bertoldi found the same prayer in Giovanni da Parma's *Sacrum commercium beati Francisci cum domina Paupertate*, published after Mestica's and d'Ancona's articles.⁵

But there is still other evidence for the probability of the reading *salve*. To die with Christ on the Cross, *cum Christo crucifigi* means the union *passionalis*, the ultimate aim of mystical contemplation, the mystical wedding, the fulfillment of the *imitatio Christi*. Now, as far as I know, the concept of weeping has scarcely been used in this connection,⁷ it belongs normally to another context, the *Pietà*, the lamentation over the dead body, whereas *salve*, climb, is one of the most important and widespread images for the description of the degrees of mystical contemplation. In Franciscan literature, it has been used very often in this context.⁸ There is

¹ *San Francesco, Dante e Giotto*, in *Nuova Antologia*, Seconda Serie, v. xxvii, 1881, p. 403.

² *Maria e la povertà*, first published in 1881, reprinted in his *Scritti danteschi*, Firenze 1912, p. 310.

³ *Il Canto di San Francesco*, lecture given in 1903 (*Lectura Dantis*), reprinted in his book *Nostri Maggiori Musa*, Firenze 1921, p. 163 with notes 63 and 64.

⁴ Lib. v cap. iii.

⁵ In Edoardo d'Alvisi's *Nota al Canto XI del Paradiso*, Città di Castello 1894, the prayer on p. 51.

⁶ Some other images, taken from the works of St Bernard, persist in *cruce*, non pati de *cruce* deponi, inhaerere *cruci*.

⁷ Except perhaps in some commentaries of Cant. 5, 6: *Anima mea liquida facta est*.

⁸ Jacopone da Todi, *Le Laude*, second edition (Ferrari and Caramella).

passage in Jacopone da Todi, where *salire* appears exactly in the same sense as in Dante's verse, describing the unio passionalis the soul, climbing up on the Cross, dying in Christ's embrace, in an ecstasy of love. In the last lines of the *Lauda Come l'anima priega li angel che l'insegnino a trovar Jesu Cristo*,⁹ when the soul has finally found Christ, the following conversation develops

— Alma, poi ch'ei venuta — respondote volentire
 La croce e lo mio letto — la 've te poi meco unire,
 sacci, si vogli salire — haveráme po' albergato —
 — Cristo amoroso, e io voglio — en croce nudo salire,
 e voglioce abbracciato — Signor, teco morire,
 gaio seram' a patire — morir teco abbracciato —

I think that this passage is a very strong support for the reading *salse*

ERICH AUERBACH

The Pennsylvania State College

SWINBURNE ON KEATS A FRAGMENT OF AN ESSAY

I

One of the lesser items in the Keats Collection of the Harvard College Library is the introductory portion of an essay on Keats that Swinburne began but did not finish. The manuscript, which

Bari 1930 (*Scrittori d'Italia*) In the *Lauda* xlv (*Come Dio appare ne l'anima en cinque modi*, p. 104) Jacopone says

En cinque modi appareme — lo Signor en esta vita
 altissima salita — chi nel quinto e entrato

And the fifth is the spiritual wedding with Christ. For the contemplative salita, see also the *Oratione a Cristo*, in *Le poesie spirituali del B. Jacopone da Todi*, published by Fra Francesco Tressatti da Lugnano, Venetia 1617, p. 676. I quote the third and the fourth stanza

Fuoco d'amor cocente	A te sposo diletto
Accendimi nel core,	Salisco contemplando,
Si che veracemente	Te Jesu mi diletto
Arso io moia d'amore,	Con affetto laudando,
Accioche ogni fetore	Sol te desiderando
Da me sia dipartito,	Con affetto infocato
Sopra di me salito	Per amor trasformato
A te mio dolce sposo	In te Cristo amoroso

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Lauda* xlii, p. 89

is entered in Sotheby's catalogue for March 13, 1917, when Watts-Dunton's library was sold, appears to have been unnoticed by Swinburne's editors and biographers. It came to Harvard in 1925 as part of the Amy Lowell Collection and is now printed by permission of the Harvard College Library. It is especially unfortunate that the fragment was not available to M. Georges Lafourcade, for it would fit naturally into his volume *Swinburne's Hyperion and Other Poems with an Essay on Keats and Swinburne* (London, 1927), on which is based the brief discussion that follows.

There is little to be gained from speculating on what Swinburne would have said if he had finished this essay, as Lafourcade remarked in his preface, "We may or may not regret the occurrence, but Swinburne certainly did not write a thesis on Keats, and certainly we are not expected to write it for him." We may, however, present what indications there are as to the date of composition.

In 1866 while engaged in editing for Moxon and Company a volume of selections from Byron, with a preface, in the "Moxon's Miniature Poets" series, Swinburne appears to have been invited by Moxon to edit Keats also. He wrote in January to William Michael Rossetti to ask what amount he should charge Moxon for his work on Byron.

An illustrious Scotch person of the name of Buchanan has done, it seems, a like office for Keats, and received £10 in return. This sum the publisher is willing to lose, and to cancel the poor devil's work, if I will do Keats instead on those terms, and won't I? and wouldn't I gratis? This forthcoming Scotch edition of Keats, who hated the Scotch as much as I do (Scotus [William Bell Scott] I consider Northumbrian by adoption and Scotch no longer) has long been a thorn in my side, and apart from the delight of trampling on a Scotch poetaster, I shall greatly enjoy bringing out a perfect edition of Keats with all his good verses and none of his bad. But all this does not help me to see what under the circumstances I ought in justice to demand for the Byron, a work less delightful and more laborious.¹

Lafourcade adds that in a letter to Lady Trevelyan in March, 1866, Swinburne says he is preparing a preface on Keats similar to the one he had just finished on Byron.² For some reason now not known Swinburne did not edit the selections from Keats. Four

¹ Lafourcade, pp. 29 f.

² See *The Complete Works of Algernon Charles Swinburne*, ed. Sir Edmund Gosse and Thomas James Wise (20 vols., London and New York, 1926-1927 [Bonchurche Edition]), xviii, 39 f.

years later, however, William Rossetti undertook an edition for Moxon called *The Poetical Works of John Keats* which was published in 1872, and for this work Swinburne contributed valuable suggestions. In a letter to William Rossetti dated May 23, 1870, he described what he considered the ideal selection and arrangement of Keats' poems. It will be noted that he regarded selection and re-arrangement as the most urgent tasks for an editor of Keats.

This was exactly the plan I had laid out for myself when requested from the same quarter as you to edit a selection from Keats. It will be a priceless boon to all lovers of Keats, as the idiotic editions of Moxon—the only ones current—have actually and inextricably jumbled together his last and best work with his first and worst, so that till I had a copy of ed. 1820 I could never read the Ode to a Nightingale without finding some schoolboy nonsense thrust in my way a few pages off.³

Somewhat later it again looked as though Swinburne would get the chance to edit Keats which he so much desired. He was asked by Edmund Gosse to contribute selections from Keats with a critical introduction, to a four-volume work called *The English Poets*. "Keats I will gladly undertake, the other three I must decline, having said my say fully on Coleridge and Blake. . . , and neither knowing enough . . . of Chatterton, nor . . . taking enough interest in him . . .," he wrote to Gosse in October, 1879.⁴ This project also failed to materialize, and Swinburne's only essay on Keats remains the one he wrote for *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1881.

This part of Lafourcade's discussion of Swinburne on Keats has been reviewed because the evidence from the letters gives clues to the date of composition of the fragment here printed. I should like to suggest, on the basis of these letters and the watermark of the manuscript (1866), *circa* March, 1866, as the probable date and late 1879 as an alternative. The evidence is, of course, extremely tenuous, but it seems likely that this fragment is the beginning of a critical introduction to a selection from Keats' poems.

II

The manuscript is written in Swinburne's hand in black ink on one side of a half-sheet of blue laid paper measuring 8 x 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ inches. The watermark is ETOWGOOD/ 1866.

³ Lafourcade, pp. 38 f.

⁴ Swinburne's *Works*, XVIII, 310.

John Keats

Among the chief names of English literature there are some whose office & influence are at once definable, there are some also whose post⁵ is as difficult to define as to deny. None of the great poets of his⁶ time have stamped their likeness so deep upon the style & manner of their successors as John Keats. It is easier to imagine a world⁷ without all the rest than a world without him⁸. He has become mixed into the memories of all, we could not dispense with him on any terms. And yet by the side of others the man & his work appear, as indeed they were, limited, partial, contracted⁹. They have not the depth & intensity of Coleridge & Wordsworth, the passion & the range of Byron & Shelley. They are unambitious to excel in any alien field. They have no message to deliver.

Worse used by editors & friends¹⁰ than any but Landor as to posthumous¹¹ arrangement of poems

By Algernon Charles Swinburne¹²

CECIL YELVERTON LANG

Harvard University

THE "SIMILE OF THE SPARROW" IN *THE RAINBOW*
BY D. H. LAWRENCE

An important aspect of the prose style of D. H. Lawrence is his use of animal imagery and symbol, in brief metaphors¹ or in the more extensive and complex images which characterize whole epi-

⁵ *Alt* part A word that looks like poster was written first and the er lined through

⁶ who, lined through, precedes his

⁷ generation lined through, world without written above

⁸ Keats lined through, him written above, with caret below the line

⁹ subject to lined through, contracted written above

¹⁰ & friends written above, with caret below the line

¹¹ posthumous appears to have been added later, the humous slants gradually below the line, and us is beneath the first two letters of arrangement

¹² By Algernon Charles Swinburne added in pencil by another hand

¹ In *The Rainbow*, for example, little Anna Lensky is "like a curled-up animal asleep but for the eyes" (Modern Library edition, New York, 1915), p. 36. Angry at Tom, Anna is "sure to dart forward her little head, like a serpent" *Ibid.*, p. 62. Will Brangwen's eyes are "like a bird's, like a hawk's" *Ibid.*, p. 99. His nature is "a separate thing, like a cat's nature" *Ibid.*, p. 105.

sodes and conflicts.² The striking symbol of the horses in the wood, in the last chapter of *The Rainbow*, is introduced by one of the oldest bird symbols in English literature, the "Simile of the Sparrow" from Bede's account of "The Conversion of Edwin."³

The central theme of the last chapter is rebirth. Ursula had been struggling to put behind her the old, spiritually barren form of life. Then aware that she was with child by Anton, so irrevocably a part of this old life, Ursula determined to set aside her striving for the fulfilment she had imagined and to accept, with all its implications,

² The interplay of bird imagery throughout the fourth chapter of *The Rainbow* culminates in the fight of the blue caps in the snow (pp. 182-83), symbolizing the conflict—and its outcome—between Anna and Will. This earlier symbolic use of birds has its echo in the later use of the simile of the sparrow.

³ From the Anglo-Saxon version of Bede's "Ecclesiastical History." The lines here are from *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader* (New York, 1947), p. 64, ll. 3-11.

swylc swā þū æt swāsendum sitte mid þīnum ealdormannum and
 þegnum on wintertide, and sie fȳr onæled and þīn heall gewyrmed,
 and hit rīne, and snīwe, and styrme ūte, cume ān spearwa and hīæd-
 lice þæt hūs þu hflēo, cume þu h ȝþre duru in, þu h ȝþre ūt gewite
 Hwæt, hē on þā tīd þe hē inne bið, ne bið hīnen mid þȳ storme þæs
 wintres, ac þæt bið ān ēagan bryht and þæt læsste fæc, ac hē sōna
 of wintra on þone winter eft cymed

The figure is so widely known that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to pin down Lawrence's source. Wordsworth uses it in number XVI of the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets"—the octave of which makes an interesting parallel reading with the Lawrentian passage.

'Man's life is like a Sparrow, mighty King'
 That—while at banquet with your Chiefs you sit
 Housed near a blazing fire—is seen to flit
 Safe from the wintry tempest Fluttering,
 Here did it enter, there, on hasty wing,
 Flies out, and passes on from cold to cold,
 But whence it came we know not, nor behold
 Whither it goes Even such, that transient Thing,
 The human Soul, not utterly unknown
 While in the body lodged, her warm abode,
 But from what world She came, what woe or weal
 On her departure waits, no tongue hath shown,
 This mystery if the Stranger can reveal,
 His be a welcome cordially bestowed!'

(This reading is from A. F. Potts, *The Ecclesiastical Sonnets of William Wordsworth* (New Haven, 1922), p. 127. Miss Potts asserts that Wordsworth's source is "Fuller, not Bede" p. 39, p. 224.)

the traditional role of child-bearer Ursula's decision to marry Anton brought a "bondaged sort of peace"⁴ — the peace of renunciation. It was an insecure peace, threatened by the inactivity of waiting in the confining, suffocating atmosphere of her parents' house. Ursula escaped by walking out into the October rain. For a moment she was satisfied. "It was very splendid, free and chaotic. Yet she hurried to the wood for shelter."⁵ The trees gave her a feeling of protection, yet she was afraid of "their martialled silence."

So she flitted along, keeping an illusion that she was unnoticed. She felt like a bird that has flown in through the window of a hall where vast warriors sit at the board. Between their grave, booming ranks she was hastening, assuming she was unnoticed, till she emerged, with beating heart, through the far window and out into the open, upon the vivid green, marshy meadow.⁶

She was alone, far from home and any sort of security, aware only of the need to find her way back to a life of stability, of significant form. Suddenly she was aware of the horses "looming in the rain"⁷ and her road back was threatened by the anarchy of elemental passion which they symbolize — the dark massed horses "running against the walls of time, and never bursting free."⁸ The loss of her child meant to Ursula the loss of the last bond tying her to the form of the past. Her recovery was a virtual rebirth. "As she grew better she sat to watch a new creation. In the still, silenced forms of the colliers she saw a sort of suspense, a waiting in pain for the new liberation."⁹ The storm, which had paralleled her conflict and illness, broke, and the rainbow — the symbol of rebirth for all the people about her — appeared.

D. H. Lawrence uses the simile of the sparrow briefly. It takes up a short paragraph in a chapter some ten pages long, one of a number of symbols and by no means the dominant one. The chapter is called "The Rainbow," and this is the final symbol. The horses remain the most vivid image for most readers. However, the simile of the sparrow is essential to a grasp of the broad theme of the chapter. It serves the specific purpose of locating Ursula's conflict in the long tradition of searching for spiritual significance in life.

Lawrence uses only that part of the passage which presents the

⁴ *The Rainbow*, p. 457

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 458

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 459

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 459

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 460

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 466

visual image—the lighted room with its rows of warriors, the bird finding temporary refuge from the storm. In the original passage (and in Wordsworth's sonnet) the simile is developed and its meaning made general. Man's life on earth is like the flight of the sparrow, man's concern is with the fate of his soul in the time unknown to him. A clear parallel is drawn between Ursula's flight from insecurity back into insecurity and the sparrow's flight through the lighted room. But Lawrence never gets away, in his explicit statement, from the specific situation centering around Ursula. Once he has made use of the concrete symbol he drops the figure. Yet, for the literate reader, the generalization which is so much a part of the original passage has been implied.

Moreover, Lawrence makes no attempt to avoid ambiguity. The forest does not become a room entirely, the trees never cease being trees. This very ambiguity allows the image to retain the implicit meaning without drawing the attention of the reader away from the particular conflict of Ursula at this specific time. Through the use of a symbol which is a part of the story of the struggle of primitive Englishmen for spiritual meaning, Lawrence lifts Ursula's conflict out of the immediate and the personal.

E. L. NICHOLS

Queens College

A NOTE ON POE IN 1838

Recent biographers of Poe assert indefinitely that Poe left New York "in the summer of 1838"¹ or "sometime in the summer of 1838"² to go to Philadelphia. The exact date is vague, in fact, comparatively little is known of Poe's activities during the summer of 1838. Some biographers assert that James Pedder, a friend, urged Poe to leave New York for Philadelphia, as well he may have.

A poem published in *Atkinson's Saturday Evening Post* in the issue of August 11, 1838 (Vol. XVII, No. 889), adds a bit to the scant knowledge of this period. The work is "Ode XXX—To Edgar A. Poe," one of the second series of odes by "Horace In

¹ Hervey Allen, *Israfel The Life and Times of Edgar Allan Poe* (New York, 1934), p. 341.

² Arthur Hobson Quinn, *Edgar Allan Poe A Critical Biography* (New York, 1941), p. 268.

Philadelphia," which was being published in the *Post* and *The Casket*,³ both of which were published in Philadelphia "Horace in Philadelphia" is Lambert A. Wilmer,⁴ who by 1838 had already been Poe's friend for several years.

It seems quite likely that the publication of this poem in the Philadelphia *Post*, in August 1838, had some connection with Poe's removal to that city, though the exact nature of this connection is conjectural. Wilmer, who was apparently living in Baltimore at the time,⁵ may have written to him in New York advising him to go to Philadelphia (where Wilmer himself had formerly lived and where he went again later).⁶ Again, Poe may have gone to Baltimore from New York of his own accord, earlier in the summer, and talked the problem over personally with his friend. On the other hand, it is quite possible that Wilmer played no part in the matter until he heard, directly or indirectly, that Poe had moved to Philadelphia, then he took the first occasion—in an early issue of the *Post*—to welcome him with a poetic tribute and help him on the way to fame.

In the words "tho' fortune now Averts her face, . . ." the ode suggests that Poe was experiencing discouragement at the time. Wilmer is authority for the assertion that Poe once studied lithography under Mr. Duval of Philadelphia, despairing of earning a living by his literary labors.⁷ Perhaps it was during the period following Poe's return to Philadelphia, when fortune frowned, that he tried to learn the new craft. We know comparatively little of Poe's activities during this period except that he must have been working on *The Conchologist's First Book*, published the following year, which was certainly hack work for the artist Poe.

³ For example, see "Ode XXV,—To Miss Molly B——," *The Casket*, XIII (August 1838), 358.

⁴ Poe's review of "The Confessions of Emilia Harrington" by Lambert A. Wilmer, Baltimore, *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. James A. Harrison, VIII, 237. Dr. Thomas Olive Mabbott first kindly informed me of the identification of "Horace in Philadelphia."

⁵ A page of advertisements immediately preceding the inside back cover of Burton's *Gentleman's Magazine*, III (December 1838), lists Lambert A. Wilmer of Baltimore as a contributor.

⁶ *Merlin, Baltimore, 1827 Together with Recollections of Edgar A. Poe* by Lambert A. Wilmer, edited with an introduction by Thomas Olive Mabbott, Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints (New York, 1941), p. x. See also Poe, *op cit*, VIII, 237.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Wilmer's ode to Poe has some merit, too, as an early favorable criticism of his friend. It shows a genuine recognition of Poe's genius, a recognition which Wilmer never lost even though he and Poe quarreled later. After forty-odd lines lamenting the fact that mediocre talents succeed while true genius is neglected, he takes comfort from the hope that time will right this wrong:

So thou dear friend, shalt haply ride
Triumphant through the swelling tide
With fame thy cynosure and guide

So may it be—tho' fortune now
Averts her face, and heedless crowds
To blocks, like senseless Pagans, bow,—
Yet time shall dissipate the clouds,
Dissolve the mist which merit shrouds,
And fix the laurel on *thy* brow

And he concludes with a reference to Poe's talents as a literary critic:

Thou once did whip some rascals from the fane
O let thy vengeful arm be felt again

CARROLL D. LAVERTY

Bryan, Texas

A FURTHER NOTE ON SWINBURNE AND WHITMAN

There is nothing to be gained from reviving the Swinburne-Whitman controversy until, so to speak, the complete returns are in, for several points of the issue are still unsettled. But though many (including myself) have mentioned the affair in print, no one apparently has noticed, or seen fit to call attention to, the various books by Whitman in the library of the "damndest simulacrum," some of which contain interesting and illuminating inscriptions. Because the information merits attention and because, so far as I know, this list has hitherto been printed only in an obscure and fairly inaccessible publication, I transcribe it here from the *Catalogue of the Library of Algernon Charles Swinburne, Esq. Deceased (Sold by Order of the Executors of the Late W. T. Watts-Dunton, Esq.)*, Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge, London, June 19-21, 1916, p. 75.

- 847 Whitman (Walt) *Drum Taps*, FIRST EDITION, *original cloth*
New York, 1865
- 848 Whitman (W) *Leaves of Grass*, 1867, *Drum Taps*, 1865, in 1 vol
half bound, m e presentation copy to Swinburne with autograph
inscription "Algernon Charles Swinburne from Walt Whitman"
New York, 1865 7
- 849 Whitman (W) *Poems*, selected and edited by Wm Michael Rossetti,
FIRST EDITION, *portrait, original cloth* 1868
- 850 Whitman (W) *After All*, not to create only, recited by Walt Whit-
man on Invitation of Managers American Institute on opening
then 40th Annual Exhibition, New York, noon, September 7, 1871,
presentation copy with autograph inscription on half title "To
Alg Chs Swinburne from the author" Boston, 1871
- 851 Whitman (W) *Democratic Vistas*, FIRST EDITION, *original wrap-*
pers, uncut, presentation copy with autograph inscription "Alg
Chs Swinburne, from Walt Whitman, Nov 1871"
Washington, D C 1871
- 852 Whitman (W) *Leaves of Grass*, *portrait inserted, uncut, presenta-*
tion copy from the author, with autograph inscription "To Alg
Chs Swinburne from Walt Whitman, Washington, U S November,
1871" 1b 1871
- 853 Whitman (W) *Leaves of Grass*, *presentation copy from the author*
with autograph inscription "Algernon Charles Swinburne from
the author with thanks and love," and portrait and photograph of
the author inserted, one with his autograph signature
Boston, 1881 2
- 854 Whitman (W) *As a Strong Bud on Pinions Free, and other Poems*,
original cloth, with the advertisements Washington, 1872
- 855 Whitman *Gems from Walt Whitman*, selected by Elizabeth Porter
Gould, *presentation copy with inscription "For Mr Algernon C*
Swinburne with the compliments of Elizabeth Porter Gould, Boston,
Massachusetts, U S A" oblong Philadelphia, 1889
- 856 Whitman (W) *Gems from* selected by Elizabeth Porter Gould,
presentation copy to Swinburne, with autograph inscription of E
P Gould, and MS poem sent to the dinner given in honour of Walt
Whitman's seventieth birthday oblong Philadelphia, 1889

CECIL Y LANG

Harvard University

A MISDATED SWINBURNE LETTER

The letter to John H Ingram which is dated "April 21st, 1874" in the Gosse-Wise edition of *The Letters of Algernon Charles Swinburne* (New York, John Lane, 1919) should, in all probability, be dated two years later. At any rate, it cannot have been written so

early as 1874, as the following check on three references in the letter will indicate

1) "M Mallarmé wrote me some time ago in acknowledgement of the reference to himself in my letter to Miss Rice" Mallarmé's letter is dated "27 janvier 1876" (See *Oeuvres complètes de Mallarmé*, edited by Henri Mondor and G Jean-Aubry, Paris, La Pléiade, 1945, page 1515) Swinburne's letter to Miss Rice is dated "November 9th [1875]" in the Gosse-Wise edition, page 220

2) 'Have you seen the admirable version of some of Poe's *Marginalia* appearing in the *République des Lettres*?' This French review did not begin to publish until December 20, 1875 The editorial footnote is also erroneous this version of the *Marginalia* was not by Mallarmé, but by Augusta Holmès

3) The reference to the Byron monument committee clearly indicates that the letter was written in 1876, when that committee was named The editors might have recognized the fact by comparing the text of this letter with that of the letter to Lord Houghton, which they printed on pages 250-252

W T BANDY

The University of Wisconsin

AN ARMENIAN PERFORMANCE OF SHELLEY'S *THE CENCI*

In Kenneth N Cameron and Horst Frenz's account of "The Stage History of Shelley's *The Cenci*"¹ and in Arthur C Hicks's introduction to his (and R Milton Clarke's) stage version of the play,² two American productions of the drama are mentioned the first by the Lennox Hill Players of New York City in June 1926, and the last by the Bellingham (Washington) Theatre Guild in March 1940

Between these two presentations was another and unique one The minutes of the Armenian Cultural Society of Los Angeles,

¹ Kenneth N Cameron and Horst Frenz, "The Stage History of Shelley's *The Cenci*," *PMLA*, LX (December 1945), 1080-1105

² Arthur C Hicks and R Milton Clarke, *A Stage Version of Shelley's Cenci* (Caldwell, Idaho The Caxton Printers, Ltd, 1945), pp 26-28.

California, for December 10, 1933, state "Shelley's 'Cenci' was performed on Dec 10, 1933 at the El Sereno Playground to an audience of members and friends in excess of 300 . . . The Armenian translation of the play was furnished in toto by Mr Manuel Tolegian, Sr The actors and actresses were all drawn from the membership and were all amateurs who had a fine command of the Armenian language [and were] chosen especially by Mr Tolegian for their enunciation and delivery "

Mr Aram Tolegian, to whom I am indebted for permission to quote from the Society's minutes above, says that he recalls remarks that *The Cenci* seemed more in character in Armenian than in English, "because the deep note of somberness throughout the drama lends itself to easy emulation among a people so persecuted that the father of every Armenian home has been an exarch of a kind, sometimes cruel and always decisive in the face of crisis"

This Armenian performance deserves at least a footnote in the history of *The Cenci* and is cited to bring the record up to date and to give further evidence that the drama has been a vehicle for acting as well as for reading

WILLIAM WHITE

Wayne University

A NOTE ON *COMUS*

When the wicked son of Bacchus and Circe tempts the Lady of the masque, one of the arguments that Milton puts in his mouth is the familiar Neo-Epicurean doctrine that if man did not use the supply of nature extravagantly, he would soon be overwhelmed with a surplussage of good—the earth would be "cumbered," the air would be "dark't with plumes," "the herds would over-multitude their Lord," and the sea would be "o'erfraught" Thus far the discussion is quite intelligible to the modern reader, but it is followed by an illustration that does not seem to fit

th' unsought diamonds
Would so emblaze the forehead of the Deep,
And so bestudd with Stars, that they below
Would grow inur'd to light, and com at last
To gaze upon the Sun with shameless brows (731-5)

The answer to this difficulty is the theory abroad in Milton's

age concerning the growth and generation of diamonds Anselm Boetius, one of the best authorities, writes that small diamonds are usually found in the head of the pits, but after they have been all taken out and the pit closed for two years, other diamonds will be found to have grown in their place¹ This is, more or less, the general scientific position of seventeenth century mineralogists But one also had to be careful about the diamonds in his casket, for Franciscus Rueus tells of a Luxemburger who had two family diamonds, "which frequently, as if by a miracle of nature, produced others"² Something of this sort clearly lies behind Comus' statement

DON CAMERON ALLEN

A NOTE ON WILLIAM LAW'S *THE ABSOLUTE
UNLAWFULNESS OF THE STAGE
ENTERTAINMENT*

It has been generally assumed by writers on William Law, notably J. H. Overton in his *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic*, that his pamphlet on *The Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage* was composed and published before his *Christian Perfection*, Chapter XI of which contains at least two-thirds of the identical material to be found in the pamphlet There are some significant discrepancies, however, between these two versions of Law's views on the stage entertainment which make their order of publication and composition important For example, the chapter in the *Christian Perfection* states that attending masquerades and attending plays are equally evil for pious Christians The pamphlet on *The Unlawfulness of the Stage*, however, says that masquerade goers are less to be censured than playgoers, thus indicating that Law's horror of the stage has increased if the pamphlet may be assumed to have been published later than the *Christian Perfection* It is thus of interest to learn that *Mist's Journal* for 11 December 1725 advertizes the *Christian Perfection* as "this day published," in spite of the fact that all editions bear the date 1726 The pamphlet on *The Unlawfulness of the Stage* is first advertized in *Mist's Journal* on 30 April 1726 This dating is further confirmed by the fact that the

¹ *Gemmarum et lapidum historia* (Lugduni, 1636), p. 121

² *De gemmis aliquot* (Tiguri, 1566), p. 4

chapter in the *Christian Perfection* contains no reference to a pantomime which Law denounces in the strongest terms and at some length in the pamphlet on *The Unlawfulness of the Stage*. The pantomime is identified in John Murray's *Gibbon's Autobiographies* (page 24) as *Apollo and Daphne*, first performed in 1726 at the Theatre Royal, Lincoln's Inn Fields. Law's quotations and descriptions of this entertainment suggest that he either heard a detailed account of it from some member of the Gibbon household where, at this time, he held the position of family chaplain and tutor to Edward Gibbon, the father of the author of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, or it may be possible that he was himself present at the entertainment since the music for it was composed by Lewis Theobald and Law's interest in music is well known.

ARTHUR WORMHOUDT

New York, N. Y.

LES LAMENTATIONS DE JÉRÉMIE ET LA POÉSIE
FRANÇAISE DU XVI^e SIÈCLE

Dans son intéressante *Anthologie de la poésie religieuse française* (Paris, 1943), pp. 57-58, Dominique Aury a publié des 'Lamentations de Jérémie' de Guillaume Guérault. La table de concordance renvoie le lecteur aux *Lamentations*, 1-12. *O vos omnes qui transitis*. Mais il est curieux de rapprocher, de ces textes, un rondeau qui a connu un succès marqué au début du XVI^e siècle, à en juger par le nombre des mss. qui le conservent. Voici une strophe du poème de Guérault.

O vous qui par cy passez,
Las pensez
A mon tourment misérable
Voyez s'il y a douleur,
Ou malheur,
A ma tristesse semblable

La deuxième strophe du rondeau¹ du Ms. 402 de Lille. *O vos omnes qui la voye passez* présente un texte assez voisin.

¹ Marcel Françon, *Poemes de transition* (Cambridge-Paris, 1938), p. 341. Dans les *Rondeaux en nombre troys cens cinquante* (Nouvellement Imprimez à Paris (f. 44v), l'incipit du rondeau est *O vous mortels*.

Tous mes espritz et membres sont lassez
 D'y cheminer, voyez doncques assez
 S'il est douleur plus grande que la mienne,
 O vos omnes

Inutile de dire qu'il s'agit ici des tourments infligés par une
 'femme du monde' que ceux qui l'aiment voudraient plus constante
 dans ses affections

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

REVIEWS

The Alphabet a Key to the History of Mankind By DAVID
 DIRINGER New York Philosophical Library, 1948 607
 pages with 256 illustrations in the text \$12 00

This great work, appearing simultaneously in England and the United States, will certainly displace all other books in its field for some time to come, at least for librarians and general readers. It contains an extraordinary mass of material in over 600 compactly printed pages, and the illustrations are mostly new and good. The author's bibliographical scent is rarely at fault and his reproduction of the essential facts concerning several hundred scripts from all over the world is in general accurate. A few striking omissions will be listed at the end of this review.

Dr Diringer is a Semitist by training (at Rome and Florence), but he has resisted the temptation to emphasize the Semitic scripts at the expense of others. Indeed he seems to be inclined, if anything, to overstress exotic and ephemeral systems of writing at the expense of better known scripts. However, since he always includes elaborate bibliographies, this "fault" will undoubtedly be considered a virtue by librarians.

The present book represents an expansion and a revision of the author's earlier book, *L'alfabeto nella storia della civiltà* (Florence, 1937). It is divided into two main parts. I, Non-alphabetic systems of writing, II, Alphabetic scripts. In successive chapters in the first part Dr Diringer takes up successively such distinct ideo-

Aubry a aussi cité (pp 159-160) un poème de La Ceppede intitulé *Vexilla Regis* c'est une allusion à l'Hymne de la Sainte-Croix de Venantius Fortunatus. Une partie du texte latin de cet hymne a été mis en musique par Delarue (cf *Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche* [Cambridge-Paris, 1934], pp 191 et 226).

graphic and syllabic systems as cuneiform, Egyptian hieroglyphic, Cretan, Indus Valley writing, Hittite, Chinese, Middle American, and the script of Easter Island. In Chapters IX and X he deals with miscellaneous ideographic and syllabic scripts, arranged with little regard for their historical or geographical relationship. Chapter XI is devoted to "quasi-alphabetic scripts," including Old Persian and Meroitic. The second part of the book is divided into ten chapters, which deal successively with the origin of the alphabet, South Semitic, Canaanite (Phoenician), Aramaic, non-Semitic offshoots of Aramaic, Indian, Further Indian (Indo-Chinese and Malayo-Indonesian), Greek and its offshoots, Italic (exclusive of Latin), Latin, runes and oghams, etc.

The author has read very widely and intelligently in preparing for this work, and his information is generally complete up to the year 1946, by which time the manuscript appears to have gone to press. There are a few striking oversights (few indeed when one considers the enormous mass of material which had to be digested, nearly all of it outside of the author's own specialties). For instance, he has overlooked C. W. Blegen's discovery in 1939 of an archive of six hundred clay tablets in Minoan Linear B from the thirteenth century B C, cf. p. 76, where the "thousands" of clay tablets in Linear B found at Cnossus (Knossos) in Crete should be reduced to "about fourteen hundred." Since Blegen's discovery was made at the site of Messenian Pylus, in the Peloponnesus, it is of the utmost potential significance for future interpretation of the Cretan and Mycenaean script of the Late Bronze Age.

Diringer is right in reducing the age of the Harappa culture of the Indus Valley, together with the hundreds of inscriptions on seals which belong to it (p. 83). There can no longer be any doubt that this culture was roughly contemporaneous with the Babylonian Dynasty of Accad (24th-22nd centuries B C), so the date of the script must be brought down even later than supposed by Diringer. On the basis of comparative archaeology it seems probable that the script ceased to be employed after about the 22nd century B C, several centuries before the probable date of the Indo-Aryan invasion of India (when the Vedic age begins).

The decipherment of hieroglyphic Hittite (pp. 89-97), already well advanced by the labors of Meriggi, Bossert, Gelb and Hrozný, promises to be completed soon, thanks to the discovery in 1946-47 of long bilinguals in Phoenician and Hittite. Found by Bossert at Kara Tepe in Cilicia, these texts have in part been published, and their discoverer is now hard at work on the study of the Hittite inscriptions. It may be added, in partial correction of the author's statements, that we now know of at least four related languages with Indo-European affinities which obviously separated from the ancestral stock much earlier than the previously known groups: cuneiform Hittite, hieroglyphic Hittite, Luwian or Luyyan, Palaic. Moreover, Lycian and Lydian (pp. 462 ff.) are no longer to be

regarded as non-Indo-European, but as younger cognates of this same "Asiatic" family, to which Achaemenian probably belongs (though the relationship is obscured by a heavy deposit of later Iranian elements)

The treatment of the origin of our own alphabet (pp 195 ff) is judicious, though the reviewer would dissent from some of the author's opinions. Now that it has become possible to date the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions rather confidently in the fifteenth century B C, they fit neatly into the general picture of the evolution of the Northwest Semitic alphabet. Moreover, the reviewer's decipherment (published in the April [1948] number of the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*) yields results which fully agree with our present knowledge of the phonology, morphology and vocabulary of the Northwest Semitic language then spoken in Palestine, Phoenicia and Lower Egypt. It follows that Gardiner's theory of the acrophonic origin of the alphabet is right, against Döring.

For some reason the author has omitted any reference to the debate between Berthold Ullman and Rhys Carpenter about the date of the borrowing of the Canaanite (Phoenician) alphabet by the Greeks (cf. his discussion and bibliography on pp 451 ff, 461 f). The former maintains a date not later than cir 1100 B C, the latter insists on a date not far from 700 B C, and not earlier than the middle of the eighth century. In the reviewer's opinion Ullman is unquestionably wrong, and Carpenter is a little too low in his chronology, though correct in principle. Ullman compares individual characters in the two systems of writing, while Carpenter insists rightly that only actually employed alphabets consisting of letters used together in inscriptions can be compared. Following Carpenter's principle and availing ourselves of the great advances in this field during the past decade, we come by comparison of the oldest Greek inscriptions with successive stages of the Canaanite alphabet to a date between cir 825 and 725 B C—probably during the first half of the eighth century. The form of such key letters as *kappa* and *mu* points to this period, and the exaggerated shaft characteristic of several of the earliest Greek letters points to the period of exaggerated shafts in the contemporary Canaanite alphabet.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Dr Döring on a splendid accomplishment, which will long remain the most complete and the best informed handbook on the scripts of mankind.

W F ALBRIGHT

The Johns Hopkins University

Heinrich Julius Duke of Brunswick By A H J KNIGHT
(Modern Language Studies III) Oxford Basil Blackwell,
1948 Pp vii + 147 12/6

Since the title of Mr Knight's monograph does not specify the literary work of the Duke as the aim of its study, its occasional excursions into the field of history proper are not wholly beside the point but are of doubtful validity when H J is represented as the scape-goat of that unfortunate age in which all the democratic currents of German historical development were thwarted and in which an urban culture gave way to the autocratic regimes of numerous petty rulers, a phenomenon to be regretted but not much elucidated as to its causes in Mr Knight's presentation. A certain weakness of Mr Knight's literary study, on the other hand, results from the absence of a clear and consistent application of a standard of valuations in this field. We are, after all, not interested in the Duke as a ruler and as an exponent of German mentality but in H J as a playwright. And as a playwright again he can hardly be praised for having produced in *Vincentius Ladislaus* "one of the best of all German comedies of any age" (p 83) which might stand favorable comparison with *Minna von Barnhelm*, *Der zerbrochene Krug*, and the plays of Molière. (For that, it is too much of a hodgepodge of anecdotes.) He interests us clearly as an author of the transition from sixteenth to seventeenth century drama. Hence, an absolute esthetic valuation seems futile, his works not attaining permanent rank, valuation can here be only relative and historical and we must ask what were his intentions and how far was he able to put them into practice.

The Horatian *prodesse* and *delectare* are, no doubt, the two main-springs of his production and the figure of the Fool is the outstanding exponent of these intentions. Jan Bouset delights his audience with a good deal of horseplay (for which Mr Knight apparently has no great liking except for the device of mishearing) and he is the mouthpiece for the Duke's preaching, either negatively as in Jan's adherence to catholicism (in the longer *Susanna*) or positively as a foil of sound common sense for the sins and extravagances of other characters. Much of the conservative rationality of the Nethersaxon Duke, the Braunschweiger of the basin between the Elbe and Weser north of the Harz mountains, is reflected in this Fool, a fact which Mr Knight might better substitute for his "German national Mind", and there is another and more esthetic factor which has escaped his attention, namely H J's keen, probably humanistic enjoyment in using language as a plaything on the one hand and as an instrument for achieving his non-esthetic effects on the other. Hence his pleasure in employing dialects, not only his native Saxon tongue (not mixed with Frankonian as so often assumed!) which he probably spoke to his servants and to some of his subjects every day, but other dialects as well, hence his Latin puns

and his dramatic diction in which he achieves genuine comic and tragic effects, a fact which Mr Knight concedes. If H. J. did not aim at individualizing his characters by means of language, that is, of course, a deficiency. But his intention of driving home his morals was his foremost purpose and to that end he played on the receptiveness of his audience, speaking through his characters directly, using them as mouthpieces for his teachings. Mr Knight's conjecture that the Duke must have had a certain model for his Vincentius because he himself, a good latinist, could not have invented the latter's faulty Latin is invalidated by Jan Clant's comical distich: "Armer Mannus ego per corbam vallere cogor / Cor mochte in dausent springere frusta meum."

It is, moreover, entirely beside the point to argue that *Der Fleischhauer* may be a poor play esthetically, but that it "contains much that is interesting and instructive, and a good deal that seems to me of considerable significance in the history of culture." This is the point of view of the historian but not of the historian of literature.

Furthermore, it impresses one as a piece of war psychology when Mr Knight insists upon seeing in H. J. an exponent of German sadism and cruelty although he has exonerated his hero on page 37 with these words: "Even in *Der Fleischhauer* there are no inhuman monsters . . . nor is there any of that sadistic and blood-thirsty weltering which, as we have seen, has sometimes erroneously been taken as the essential component of Heinrich Julius' tragedies" (p. 37). In fact, Mr Knight sees in this a peculiarity of the English comedians (p. 33) and "of the manner of Seneca and Kvd" (p. 52). All the more surprising now to find his harking back with assent to that accusation in the later parts of his book, especially when reference is made to *Faust*, Kleist, Tieck, Arnim, Hoffmann, Buchner, Hebbel, and Hauptmann (*Hannele*!).

It belongs to the same line of thinking when the argument is proffered that Vincentius is a victim of a mentality which would mistreat the individual "as a discarded social type, the representative of talents and ideals which the State no longer recognizes or needs" (p. 88). Vincentius, for that matter, cannot possibly be regarded as a "discarded type" according to Mr Knight's own description since he is the first of the bombastic Baroque characters. It must, therefore, be Duke Silvester who is behind his time, especially as members of the court in their common sense speech and behavior show none of the "exuberant tendency to Baroque ornamentation of language" with which this Paduan Vincentius is afflicted, probably on account of his Italian provenience.

In *Vincentius* Mr Knight sees the Duke's best achievement while his attempt to create a Baroque tragedy in *Der ungeratene Sohn* miscarried since "here the offences go against the world order" and hence "involves a tragic view of life" not in harmony with the

Duke's general attitude. However, since the villain is punished just as in all the other plays, the world order is in no way disturbed and, therefore, Mr Knight's argument seems hardly justified. The long as well as the short *Susanna* both belong rather more to the preceding century and are in spite of certain merits summarily dismissed with an unwarranted accusation that their admirers, Holl and Grimm, have never read the play. Holl, by the way, unmistakably characterizes *Vincentius* as the Duke's most interesting production while praising in *Susanna* (as his "Hauptdrama," which does not necessarily mean his "best play") the polymythian structure and other attempts at a new technique.

It is a questionable hypothesis to assume that H. J. was detached and conscious enough of his own limitations so that he "may have been content to stop at the height of his success and reputation rather than risk an almost certain decline of both," questionable especially in the light of the naiveté repeatedly attributed to him.

In spite of this lengthy list of strictures and disagreements with the author, however, the reviewer does not wish to suggest that Mr Knight's investigation is without merit. Granted a critical reader, it should prove to be a useful and exhaustive study of the subject, to which little could be added.¹

ERNST FEISE

Essays um Goethe. Zweiter Band. Von ERNST BEUTLER. Mit 17 Abbildungen. Wiesbaden: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung [1947]. Pp. xix + 372.

Erschuttert und mit Grauen liest man den Vorbericht dieses Buches, der von dem stufenweisen Untergang des alten Goethegeburtshauses im Großen Hirschgraben durch Brand und Bomben erzählt, und findet sich am Schlusse wieder aufgerichtet durch den Mut und die Zuversicht Ernst Beutlers, seines Direktors, aus dessen Worten der Lebensmut des Dichters spricht, der ihn mit seinem Geiste erfüllt hat wie der Gott des Altertums seinen Priester und Seher. Nur so verstehen wir eigentlich, wie es dem Goetheforscher Beutler möglich war, ein solch im Grunde heteres Buch über die Goethezeit zu schreiben, in welchem wir die Lili und die Corona, den Maler Kraus und den Baumeister Coudray, den Schweizer Knaben Peter im Baumgarten und den Heidjer Eckermann um und mit Goethe leben und wirken sehen.

Ein reizendes Buchlein für einen Damentisch mit seinen anmutigen Bildern, mochte man es nennen, wenn es nicht zugleich ein gewichtiges Buch für den Forscher wäre. Aus überragender Sach-

¹ Probably owing to the present disorganization of bibliographical instruments the valuable dissertation of Pfutzenreuter (Münster 1936) has escaped the author's attention.

kenntnis, Leben in den Personen, den Orten, der Gesellschaft der Goethezeit, Meister des Wortes und der Stimmung kann Beutler mit den Dingen spielen ohne je die tiefe und ernste Bedeutung der Vorgänge aus den Augen zu verlieren, nicht nur für jene sondern auch für unsere Tage. Ob er in beiläufig eingefügten Relativsätzen für den Uneingeweihten ein Lebensbild rundet, ob er auf Grund neuer Funde nach gründlicher Prüfung eine landläufige Tradition abtut, immer schöpft er aus dem Ganzen und geht auf das Ganze.

Am schönsten ist von den sechs Lebensbildern vielleicht das erste und das letzte. Im ersten hat Beutler die goldne Atmosphäre der Lilizeit eingefangen, aber zugleich auch den Untergrund eines tragischen Losreisens Goethes von jenem Wesen, das wie keine andere vielleicht dem Dichter hatte ebenbürtige Gattin werden können, im letzten errichtet er dem treuen Helfer und berufenen Portratisten des alten Goethe, Johann Peter Eckermann, dessen kunstlerisches Darstellen so oft unterschätzt worden ist, ein würdiges Denkmal. Der Band schließt mit einer tiefgefühligen Geschichte der Motivwandlung einer Ballade, vom "Geistesgruß" über den "König von Thule" bis zu "Lorelei," einer Wandlung, die zugleich durch ein Beispiel der geistes- und formgeschichtlich aufeinanderfolgende Generationen der Romantik im weiteren Sinne des Wortes kontrastiert. Hier allein kann ich einen Zweifel nicht unterdrücken, den ich von je der Wertung des "Königs von Thule" gegenüber gefühlt habe: ist diese Dichtung nicht sehr zeitbedingt? Ist sie nicht nach dem Weirtheil mit dem Egmont sogar schon für Goethe überlebt? Ein wenig Rittertheatralik, nicht echt volksliedhaft wie das "Heidenroslein" sondern vom Ossian her sentimentalisiert, wie dieser alte Herr noch im Sterben Staatsgeschäfte und Liebestreue vor seinen Rittersn abhandelt. Die Worte Zelterns über den Vortrag des Gedichtes an eine junge Sangerin, "Bitte—sanft und frei,—als saßen Sie am Ufer des Meeres, ganz in Gedanken versunken," geben fast der Erklärung Berlioz' recht, wenn er sagt: "Il est évident que rien au monde n'occupe moins Marguerite dans ce moment que les malheurs du roi der Thulé, c'est une visible histoire qu'elle a apprise dans son enfance et qu'elle fredonne avec distraction." Wie sollte Gretchen, die ganz Untheatralische, es auch sonst singen, so daß es der Zuschauer versteht, ohne theatralisch zu werden?

Aber das ist ein Einwand, mit dem diese Anzeige eines Buches eigentlich nicht belastet werden sollte, das gleicherweise für den Goethekenner wie den Goethefreund eine goldene Gabe ist.

ERNST FEISE

Chaucer's World Compiled by EDITH RICKERT, edited by CLAIR C OLSON and MARTIN M CROW, illustrations selected by MARGARET RICKERT New York Columbia Univ Press, 1948 Pp xii + 456 \$6 75

This book, originally designed as a memorial to Edith Rickert, may be described as an anthology made up of excerpts chiefly documentary rather than literary in character, and given unity by being "grouped about the life of a typical fourteenth-century person" (p xi). Though Chaucer, the person in question, was a man of genius and therefore anything but typical of his time, his life of course had many aspects typical enough, and it is upon these aspects that the book throws light, as a rule. Not always, it is true. Sometimes the selections were chosen for other reasons, though even so they also serve to illustrate Chaucer's world. For instance, we read, "Believing, as some of us now do, that Chaucer had the habit of drawing his figures from the life, we are faced with the question whether Gilbert Maghfeld was the original of the Merchant" (p 192). Miss Rickert's interest in this question had much to do with her decision to include in her book a long series of excerpts from Maghfeld's account book (pp 185-193), the particular excerpts chosen in many cases have Chaucerian associations of one kind or another, and one of them is about Chaucer himself, or so it would seem. The introduction of such matter is of course not merely proper but happy. Miss Rickert and her associates in the work have made the documentary material far more interesting to us by including many selections which "deal with people, places, or events that Chaucer himself knew or knew of" (p xi).

The anthology falls into ten parts, illustrative of as many aspects of fourteenth-century ways: (1) London Life, (2) the home, (3) training and education, (4) careers, (5) entertainment, (6) travel, (7) war, (8) the rich and the poor, (9) religion, and (10) death and burial. Many of the excerpts come from familiar and readily accessible sources, as *The Babees Book* and the *Book of the Knight of La Tour-Landry*. But much of the material used has never before been published. The excerpts taken from Latin or French documents are given in translation, those taken from writings in Middle English are given in a more or less modernized form. The source of the excerpt is regularly stated, and there is a considerable amount of annotation and other commentary where such seems needful or for other reasons desirable. Each item is given a descriptive title, supplied by the compiler or one of the editors. In addition, the items are grouped under headings; thus, the first group of items in Chapter 2 (the home) is headed "marriage." It will be seen that the book is carefully organized, and, though designed primarily for readers innocent of foreign languages and even of Middle English, it is provided with the usual scholarly apparatus.

The illustrations are many, well chosen, and nearly always well reproduced. The picture of Miss Rickett herself is particularly good.

One weakness of books of this kind needs to be mentioned, although the reviewer has no cure to suggest. Official records and literary records alike tend to exaggerate the evils of the times, a blameless life more often than not is passed over in silence. This is particularly true of legal records, of course, records made up chiefly of cases involving law-breakers. Miss Rickett was obviously alive to this difficulty, she has found a surprising number of documents descriptive of everyday life. But the unreflecting reader may nevertheless conclude that life in the fourteenth century was lived more dangerously and more wickedly than it really was. Let me end on this note of warning.

KEMP MALONE

The Oxford History of English Literature, edited by F. P. WILSON and BONAMY DOBRÉE. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. Vol. II, Part 1, *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century*, by H. S. BENNETT (1947, pp. viii + 326), Part 2, *The Close of the Middle Ages*, by E. K. CHAMBERS (1945, pp. vi + 247).

Of the twelve volumes which are to make up this history, two have now come out, the fifth and the second. The volume here under review is oddly planned. One would have expected Part 1 to deal with the fourteenth, Part 2 with the fifteenth century. Instead, four essays by E. K. Chambers, devoted respectively to "medieval drama," "the carol and fifteenth-century lyric," "popular narrative poetry and the ballad," and "Malory," have been put together in a book (Part 2) and what was left of fifteenth-century literature has been combined with Chaucer to make another book (Part 1). The fourteenth-century literary monuments not by Chaucer will presumably be treated in the first volume of the history. This separation of Chaucer from his age can hardly be justified, though Mr. Bennett has tried to make up for it by laying special stress on Chaucer's background and the "events which shaped his career" (p. v). Equally objectionable is the division of the fifteenth-century writings, which ought to have been taken up together, if only to bring out their interrelations.

Part 1 is almost evenly divided between Chaucer and the fifteenth century. The author writes pleasantly, and he has obviously borne in mind "not only the scholar but also the 'general reader' who has no special knowledge of English literature but is interested in it for its own sake or as a part of the history of the English people" (back cover). If his discussion seems a bit thin, one must remember that he had a great deal to cover and little space to cover it in. The

text proper is confined to 217 pages, over 100 pages being reserved for chronological tables, bibliography, and index. The author knows his way about, and gives us a useful book. Now and then old misconceptions reveal themselves, as when he quotes the parson's *rum, ram, ruff by lettre* (p. 10) but ignores (like everybody else) the next line

Ne, god wot, ȝym holde I but litel better

He also quotes with approval an estimate of Chaucer as "an artist in a sense in which the word can be used of no other English poet before him" (p. 43), forgetting the *Beowulf* poet, who was surely as great an artist, in every sense, as Chaucer. The treatment of Chaucer's diction (pp. 82 ff.) is marred by the dictum "Chaucer wrote in an age when words were still limited in their associations." Actually, of course, words differed then, as they do now, in this matter. The author's illustration, *alone*, is an unhappy one, this word was felt more vividly then than now, and needed no reinforcement by *all* as it needs today. In OE the *ān* by itself meant 'alone,' and the prefixed *al* 'all' served to intensify the meaning, just as *all* now does in *all alone*. It remains true, however, that Chaucer, not unlike our poets of today, deliberately avoided the poetic diction which had come down from OE times and was still in use in the fourteenth century. Unluckily Mr. Bennett's dictum is not so phrased as to bring out this important point, and he says nothing about it in his discussion either. Finally, I note an odd statement in the valuable chapter on the author and his public: "changing conditions in Chaucer's time and after, however, made it increasingly difficult for men to find it worth while to devote their whole time to writing" (p. 109). But were the conditions any more favorable for full-time writing before Chaucer's day?

Part 2 differs markedly from Part 1. It is well written, but makes no concessions to the general reader, who will find its erudite, closely packed pages heavy going. The author gives us an authoritative treatment of the particular matters with which he deals, but his narrative dries up one's mouth. It would hardly do to say that Chambers misses the literary quality of the texts about which he is writing, but he certainly does not dwell upon the artistic side of things. Moreover, the four essays stand each for itself, with little attempt at integration with each other or with the fifteenth century as a whole. In this respect Part 1 is decidedly superior to Part 2, although less authoritative than the work of the old master. It needs to be added that Chambers sometimes shows signs of not being altogether up to date. I note in particular that he still marks long the second (instead of the first) element of OE diphthongs, in accordance with the usage customary in Bosworth's day but long since abandoned (see p. 122).

KEMP MALONE

Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England By CHARLES W
JONES Ithaca Cornell Univ Press, 1947 Pp xvi + 232
\$3

This fine book falls into two parts (1) five chapters on hagiography and annalistic writing, chapters which range widely but center about Bede, and (2) two translations, one of the anonymous monk of Whitby's life of Gregory the Great, and one of Felix's life of Cuthbert. After the translations comes a 39-page appendix to chapter 3, followed by 21 pages of notes and a 12-page index. The book has two illustrations, the labels of which have been exchanged. The author writes in a lively and readable style, though his translations do not read so well, since he tries to reproduce (so far as one can in English) the infelicities of the Latin originals. In the following I will limit myself to the first part of the book.

The first chapter, called "The Setting," is the best brief presentation known to me of the conditions which led to the writing of saints' lives and chronicles in the early Middle Ages. Besides, this chapter corrects earlier views in various respects and throws light on everything it touches. The second chapter, "Chronicles," takes up the annalistic matter in certain works of Bede, and plausibly explains how this material came to be written and how it fits into the body of the work of which it makes part. The third chapter has for title "Time References in the Ecclesiastical History." The author here wrestles with a problem recently discussed by W. Levison in Appendix VI of his *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*. Levison's solution is attractively simple, but Jones probably comes nearer the truth with his more complicated account of things. This chapter, together with its appendix (see above), also serves as a study of Bede's sources, as such, it will be the part of the book of greatest interest and value to historians. Men of letters, however, will find Jones's fourth and fifth chapters more important. In the fourth chapter, called "Hagiography," the author characterizes and analyses the saint's life as a literary form, using for illustration several lives of the period, in particular, he contrasts Bede's *Historia Abbatum*, a truly historical work, with his life of Cuthbert, a truly hagiographical composition. Jones believes, no doubt rightly, that the great differences between these two pieces of writing reflect differences of *genre*, hagiography is not history, if one looks at the matter from a literary point of view, but something fundamentally different. In chapter five, devoted chiefly to Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, the author is confronted with a work which combines hagiography and history. He solves the literary problem by calling it a mixture of *genres*, as he puts it, Bede sought "to combine these incongruous [literary] conventions in a single work" (p. 92). But he hastens to add that "the fusion was incomplete." It would be better, I think, to say that there was no fusion, that Bede simply shifted from one *genre* to the

other, time after time, in the course of composition. One may compare the mixture of prose and verse in Icelandic and Irish sagas

KEMP MALONE

Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue anglaise By FERNAND MOSSÉ IAC, Rue Victor-Lagrange, Lyon, 1947 Pp [xii], 269 = Collection "Les Langues du Monde" publiée par Henri Hierche Série grammaire, philologie, littérature. Volume II

This sketch of the history of the English language, though short, is both eminently readable and, as it seems, quite trustworthy, and one would not expect anything else from a scholar of Mossé's standing

He divides his material into an introduction, dealing with the prehistory of English, and six chapters covering the rest. The first chapter deals with Old English, the second with Middle English, the third with the Renaissance (1500-1660), the fourth with the Restoration and the pre-Romantic movement (1660-1798), the fifth with the nineteenth century and after, and the sixth with English as a World language. Every chapter is followed by a selective bibliography, and the book itself is brought to a close with a general bibliography. These bibliographies testify to the alertness and the discernment of the author: nothing of value seems to have escaped him.

As Mossé remarks in the preface, this is a sketch of the external history of the English language—written from very much the same point of view as Baugh's well known work. An attempt is made to relate the history of the language to political and cultural movements. Hence the attitudes of the speakers and writers to their language are carefully listed when known, the vocabulary and even the style of verse and prose receive as much attention as the syntax and the phonology, which in earlier works received by far the most attention. But comparison with Baugh's work should not lead to the assumption that Mossé has made an extract so to speak from Baugh: on the contrary Mossé obviously draws upon his own collections, for in spite of his conciseness he manages to quote verbatim a good number of passages from English authors illustrating the trend of their opinions and their ways of handling the language. One can guess where these quotations come from when one reads that Mossé has under preparation a *Grammaire historique de la langue anglaise*. May it soon be published!

One more commendable feature of the book might be mentioned: the dialect maps and the graphs showing the influx of French loan-words in English and the frequency of the *will/shall* constructions.

It seems to me that this book might well be translated to take its place with Jespersen's *Growth and Structure* and other foreign works on English

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

Fernão Mendes Pinto Un précurseur de l'exotisme au XVI^e siècle

PAUL G. LE GENTIL Paris Hermann & C^o, Éditeurs, 1947

Pp 344

Fernão Mendes Pinto, diplomat, pirate, merchant, liar, traveler, novelist, would-be Jesuit companion of St Francis Xavier, was born in Portugal about 1510. The years 1537 to 1558 he spent in the East, from Abyssinia to Japan, but mainly in the coastal regions and on the adjoining seas of southeast Asia and nearby islands, Burma, Malaya, Sumatra, Java, Siam, southern China, and Kyushu. After his return to Portugal he wrote a book. He died in 1583, leaving behind his manuscript, which was printed in 1614 in Lisbon by Pedro Crasbeeck.¹

The book, which purports to be an account of his adventures, his "peregrination," and of what he saw and heard in the East, has been the subject of much debate. The general tenor of this debate is perhaps best indicated by a pun with which the Portuguese are still fond of plying foreigners: "Fernão, mentes? Minto." Historians of the Society of Jesus, and in particular biographers of St Francis Xavier, have long been interested in the *Peregrinação* because it is a source for part of the life of the Apostle of the Indies.

Professor Le Gentil has studied the *Peregrinação* closely and carefully and has given us an objective statement of what the book is, of what manner of man its author was. His study is divided into three main sections: I, "Biographie," in which he tries to disentangle the facts of Mendes Pinto's life, II, "Valeur documentaire," in which he attempts to distinguish the true from the false in the account of the places and institutions, particularly the religions, which Mendes Pinto has written, and III, "Valeur littéraire (La mise en œuvre)," in which he endeavors to evaluate the

¹ The title as it appears in the first edition gives an excellent idea of the contents: *Peregrinação de Fernam Mendez Pinto Em que da conta de muytas e muyto estranhas cousas que vio & ouuiu no reyno da China, no da Tartaria, no do Sornau, que vulgarmente se chama Sião, no do Calaminhan, no de Pegu, no de Martauão, & em outros muytos reynos & senhorios das partes Orientais, de que nestas nossas do Occidente ha muyto pouca ou nenhũa noticia. E tambem da conta de muytos casos particulares que acontecerão assi a elle como a outras muytas pessoas. E no fim della trata breue mente de algũas cousas, & da morte do santo Padre mestre Francisco Xauier, vnica luz & resplandor daquellas partes do Oriente, & Reytor nellas vniuersal da Companhia de Iesus* (Copy in Harvard College Library)

good Fernão as a writer, psychologist, *moraliste*, and precursor. The dominant conclusion is that the *Peregrinação* is not an autobiography but a novel, "un roman documenté et documentaire" (p 237). It is a mixture of the true and the false, of observations and hearsay, of the unconsciously twisted and the purposely distorted, with a strong artistic current throughout. "Donc il ne composeira ni une histoire, ni un routier, ni une cosmographie. Quand on cherche à définir la solution inédite, mais hybride qu'il a trouvée, on penche tantôt vers le roman, tantôt vers le récit documentaire du type de l'*Histoire tragico-maritime*" (p 260).

The author skillfully places the *Peregrinação* in its proper setting in the development of exoticism in western European literature, of travel literature, of that literature which opened Europe's eyes to new horizons, with extraordinary and well-known results in eighteenth-century France.²

A propos of Fernão Mendes Pinto's fate in France in the seventeenth century (p 304), the ballet *L'oracle de la Sybille de Pan-soust*, of 1645, is of interest. For *entrée* XIII presents "Fernand Mendez Pinto, avec deux matelots, consultant l'oracle sur la découverte de l'isle de Calampluy".³

In an appendix to his study, Professor Le Gentil discusses the exotic vocabulary of Mendes Pinto. He does not, however, draw on the two short articles which Dr A. R. Nykl has published in *Petrus Nonius*.⁴

Both Professor Le Gentil and Dr Nykl call attention to the need for a critical edition of the *Peregrinação*, with full commentary and, I would add, adequate maps, an edition not unlike the Yule *Marco Polo*. There is also need of a popular edition of the text in English. The 1891 reprint⁵ of Henry Cogan's translation is not available on the market and the recent *Portuguese Voyages* in the Everyman's Library gives only one rather long extract.⁶

FRANCIS MILLET ROGERS

Harvard University

² Two other recently published books on this subject are most valuable. Clarence Dana Rouillard, *The Turk in French History, Thought and Literature (1520-1660)*, Paris, 1940, and Marie Louise Dufrenoy, *L'Orient Romanesque en France 1704-1789*, Montreal, 1946, with a second volume, *Bibliographie Générale*, Montreal, 1947.

³ Cf. Victor Fournel, *Les contemporains de Molière*, Tome deuxième, Paris, 1866, p. 272.

⁴ A. R. Nykl "Algumas observações sobre as linguas citadas na 'Peregrinação' de Fernão Mendes Pinto," *Petrus Nonius*, III (1941), 180-185, "Mais observações sobre as linguas citadas na 'Peregrinação' de Fernão Mendes Pinto," *Petrus Nonius*, IV (1942), 57-58.

⁵ *The Voyages and Adventures of Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, the Portuguese*. An abridged and illustrated edition, London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1891, xxvii and 464 pp.

⁶ *Portuguese Voyages 1498-1663*. Edited by Charles David Ley, London and New York, 1947 (Everyman's Library 986).

The New Science of Giambattista Vico Translated from the third edition (1744) by THOMAS GODDARD BERGIN and MAX HAROLD FISCH Ithaca, New York Cornell University Press, 1948 Pp xv + 398

The first German and French translations of the *Scienza Nuova* go back to the eighteen-twenties, the first English translation has just been published. As it is the latest, it is also the most complete and accurate which has come to my knowledge, and it is more adequate to the genius of the author than most of the earlier ones.

It is both passionately exciting and exceedingly difficult to translate Vico. During the first decades of the eighteenth century, long before the dawn of Romanticism, in a Cartesian atmosphere of scientific thought, an atmosphere alien to any philosophy based on the study of human history, Vico created a conception of historical evolution founded on his discovery of the magic and animistic character of primitive society. He anticipated almost all the basic principles of modern ethnology, and his work contains the germs of almost all modern ideas about the origin and early development of religion, language, poetry, law and society. It is highly speculative and full of errors in detail, but it is superior to modern scientific works of a similar kind by its magnificent unity of inspiration. Vico's ideas are the result of an interpretation of classical myth and poetry and of Roman law, they are the achievements of an old professor of Latin rhetoric, they are presented in a style which is a unique combination of an immense, but somewhat confused erudition, and of an almost mystic intuition. Once his Italian style has been mastered, it reveals its suggestive power and its moving beauty. To imitate it in another language and in another era is a tremendous task. Vico writes long, involved sentences, linked together by a continuous flowing movement, a *motus animi continuus*, there is, in the rhythm of his sentences, a particular kind of stressing, in his self-created terminology he uses certain words in different meanings, to be understood only in the context. A translator is in constant danger either of becoming obscure by following Vico too closely or of ruining his style, which is essential for the substance of his ideas.

Each sentence and each word of this translation reveals the continuous endeavour to understand and the patient love which Professor Bergin and Professor Fisch have devoted to the exact rendering of the movement of idea and rhythm. On the whole, they have been very conservative, especially with regard to the terminology, where they have followed Vico's expressions as closely as possible, they explain their procedure in the short preface, and it is, indeed, the safest way. All paraphrasing involves interpretation. Still, at times, cautious interpretation might be useful. In my German translation (1924), I was obliged to paraphrase or even to

change much more than the English translators did, e g, it is possible to render Vico's *civile* by English *civil*, but in German, neither *zivil* nor *bürgerlich* can be used, I was obliged to resort to *geschichtlich*, and sometimes to *politisch*, and I felt that a certain degree of paraphrastic interpretation can make the terms more readily understood. The translators have been less conservative when it comes to style and syntax, they have broken up most of Vico's long sentences. Again, there can be no doubt that it is the right way, even a necessity if one wants to write English. And still, there are certain convolutions which are destroyed by this procedure and which an admirer of Vico's style may miss with regret. There are also a few passages where I disagree with the translation, I have submitted my observations to the translators for consideration. But none of these possible mistakes is really inimical to the understanding of Vico's main ideas.

The admirable editions and researches of Croce and Nicolini have considerably helped Vico students during the last 40 years. The translators were able to use Mr Nicolini's *editio minor*, published in 1928, with its clear disposition and numbering of the paragraphs. As in this edition, there are neither an introduction nor notes in the translation. As for an introduction, Professor Fisch has given it earlier in his and Mr Bergin's translation of Vico's autobiography (1944). It is a very good and modern introduction, enriched by the results of Nicolini's recent researches,¹ it also contains some very interesting facts and suggestions concerning Vico's reputation and influence in England and America. As for the notes, some short explanations of contemporary discussions and of certain quotations and allusions might have been useful. But this is not important. The translators have succeeded in giving a good English text of the *Scienza Nuova*, the first and the greatest monument of modern historical thought. I hope many readers may feel something of that severe joy (*res severa verum gaudium*) which the writers have certainly felt during their work.

ERICH AUERBACH

The Pennsylvania State College

¹ Since 1944, Mr Nicolini has published a completed and reorganized edition of Croce's *Bibliografia Vichiana* (2 vol., Napoli, Ricciardi, 1947-48), and a new edition of the *Autobiografia* (Milano, Bompiani, 1947). The latter contains in its appendix (*Medaglioni illustrativi*) not only a resume of his earlier biographical researches, but also some important new material. I have found most interesting the chapters on Vico's friends and on the Neapolitan "atheists."

Dante's American Pilgrimage. A Historical Survey of Dante Studies in the United States 1800-1944 By ANGELINA LA PIANA
New Haven Yale University Press, 1948 Pp xi + 310

In some of its details, the record of the study and enjoyment of Dante in America is curiously impressive. Charles Eliot Norton's translation of the *Vita Nuova*, for instance, was first published in three consecutive issues of the *Atlantic Monthly* (Jan-March, 1859), the first issue of the *National Quarterly Review* (1860) carried a long article on Dante by its editor, and from around that time to the present no less than a dozen translations of the entire *Divina Commedia* have been made in this country. Professor La Piana counts nine. But since her book went to press a new translation of the poem has been distributed to subscribers by the Book of the Month Club and this reviewer has seen in manuscript two more translations which aspire to early publication. Even so, our record in translations of the poem will hardly compare with that of England where fifteen translations of the Comedy appeared in the space of twenty years (1880-1900).

Of course, the vogue of Dante in America may not properly be explained by the cultural historian in isolation from the study of Dante in England. Prof. La Piana is well aware of the fact. There is, indeed, one significant aspect of the matter which she is quick to point out: the early study of Dante in America, for all its dependence upon the rise of that study in Romantic times in England, was one of the forces which contributed toward breaking the hold of a too narrow and provincial preoccupation with the literature of the mother country. The study of Dante, because of our particular situation in history, became a broadening influence with us in quite a special way.

The fifty-year-old work of T. W. Koch, *Dante in America*, had been the only general survey of the subject available. Prof. La Piana's study will therefore be most welcome to specialists in Dante, first of all, because her work presents a detailed, thorough, and accurate inventory of the whole of Dante scholarship in America from even pre-scholarly times to the present, and to historians of American culture, because it is precisely a noteworthy chapter in that more general subject.

The author has nowhere lost sight of the historical importance of her subject. Neither has she exaggerated it. This type of study is usually threatened, on the one hand, by a loss of perspective due to the arbitrary isolation of the subject, and, on the other, by the temptation to allow the survey to become an inventory list of names and titles connected in any kind of exposition which will serve that purpose. With this particular study there was perhaps a third danger: that the *cult* of Dante itself and that certain names connected with it (Longfellow, Lowell, Norton, Grandgent) should bring about a certain uncritical if not worshipful attitude on the

part of its author. None of this has happened. On the contrary, one admires throughout not only the firmness and fairness of the author's judgment, but a strain of irony and humor as well.

Should it happen that another half century pass before a general survey of Dante studies in America is again undertaken, one may hope that by that time those studies will have deserved as good an historian as they have found in the present instance.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

Harvard University

Between Fervor and Flur, A Study of the Concept of Poetry in the Criticism of T. S. Eliot By SISTER MARY CLEOPHAS COSTELLO
Washington, D. C. The Catholic University of America Press,
1947. Pp. 122.

In 1929 T. S. Eliot wrote of the urgent need "for experiment in criticism of a new kind, which will consist largely in a logical and dialectical study of the terms used" (p. 1). The present dissertation undertakes to determine what T. S. Eliot himself has discovered about the meaning of the term *poetry*. That he has not arrived at a final definition is, of course, implicit in one of his broadest critical aims, which is, as this reviewer conceives it, to assist the esthetician in forming a modern poetics but not to construct that poetics himself. In searching out the contradictions in Eliot's use of terms and his failure to locate the differentia of poetry, Sister Costello makes the ultimate demand on this poet's criticism, namely, that it be systematic and that it be synthesized into a logical whole. "The critic," she maintains, "if he is to be consistent and clear, must have an explicit philosophical background" (p. 108). This dictum, however true, should not be applied to the criticism of T. S. Eliot, which contains its expressed limitations and is, on the whole, a system of questions. Still, it is of great importance to follow the development of Eliot's terms and contradictions, and Sister Costello has discharged this function admirably.

The author makes a careful examination of Eliot's views on the "structure of meaning" and the affective use of poetry. These questions introduce the elements of feeling and emotion as factors in the total structure of the poem. A poem is a structure of meanings because it is built of words, but it is also "a structure of sounds whose fitness contributes materially to the unity of the whole work" (p. 60). The "meaning structures," at least in the kind of poetry Eliot admires, are apprehensible as thought but are somehow brought within the grasp of feeling. A poet's use of philosophy, for example, is not to support the truth of an assertion but to use it as a datum of perception, to deal with it in terms of something

perceived. Thus a whole poetic work becomes, as Eliot says, "intellectual sanction for feeling, and esthetic sanction for thought." Nevertheless, poetry is not a transference of human emotion from artist to audience, but the creation of an art object in which emotion is depersonalized and the feeling made "significant" for art. The poet finds an "objective correlative" for his emotion and this is the formula for that particular emotion in the poem.

Sister Costello treats Eliot's term *poetry*, in the following summation: "if in a sound structure which is perfectly adapted to it the affective meaning is 'fixed with intensity' in a cognitive meaning structure, that discourse is poetry" (p. 85). What ultimately differentiates poetry from "verse" is the degree of intensity with which the affective meaning is fixed in the cognitive meaning. If the intensity is greater in the affective meaning, that meaning supposedly will begin to *act*, as prose discourse acts, and "verse" will result.

Apart from the grave demand for consistency and logic that Sister Costello makes upon her subject, this study of Eliot's concept of *poetry* is a sound prosodic document written on a level of inquiry which most 19th century studies in this science failed even to attempt.

KARL SILAPIRO

The Johns Hopkins University

The Prosodic Theory of Gerard Manley Hopkins By SISTER MARCELLA MARIE HOLLOWAY. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. 121.

Until quite recently the study of Gerard Manley Hopkins as a prosodic theorist has been largely ignored in favor of the poet's remarks, often of a fragmentary kind, on his own prosodic practice. Two reasons are uppermost: the general disinterest in theory of prosody and the unavailability of Hopkins' materials. Between 1918, the date of the first edition of the poems, and 1935, when the Hopkins papers began to be published, certain prejudices about Hopkins' theory and practice of poetry became well established. Chiefly, it was believed that Hopkins' account of his prosody was an attempt to justify the extreme "license" of his versification, that his theory, if any, was a subterfuge, and that in reality he was ignorant of his subject. Among the critics who contributed to these views were J. M. Hone, Robert Bridges, George Saintsbury, T. S. Omond, I. A. Richards, F. R. Leavis, G. M. Young, and T. S. Eliot—in short, some of the foremost critics of the age. A more serious type of investigation based on all known Hopkins materials has superseded most of this early criticism, such studies as W. H.

Gaidner's *Gerard Manley Hopkins* (1944), Harold Whitehall's *Sprung Rhythm* (1945), and the present dissertation are examples

Sister Holloway suggests that from his earliest writings Hopkins was searching for a common prosodic principle that would include structures of meaning and structures of sound. Poetry, according to this theory, "is a structure of intimately related parallelisms, the structure influencing the thought, the thought in turn being shaped or formed by the conditions of the rhythm" (p. 24). There is little question that Hopkins' primary concern with the structure of the literary object, its unity and its inner diversity, led to his penetrating insights into the nature of English rhythms and the use of his own system of prosody.

Various characteristics of Hopkins' own verse practices are shown convincingly to be based upon his general view of the nature of English rhythm, although "scansion" was never, in the poet's mind, the end of prosody. The background of the "Preface" is considerably deepened in the chapters on *Metre* and "*Sprung Rhythm*" and *Time and Measure*. Hopkins' interest in triple time cadences and ballad measure relates him to Coleridge in practice and Patmore in theory, his interest in Milton's versification, which this study documents very well, sheds the best light on "counterpoint" rhythms. The influences of Welsh and Anglo-Saxon rhythms, however, are not so well detailed.

Perhaps the best service of this dissertation is that of bringing to light the importance of quantity in Hopkins' theory. Time or equality in strength is shown to be of more importance in sprung rhythm than in common rhythm and an essential part of the prosody of accentual verse (pp. 76-77). The question raised by Mr. Harold Whitehall that Hopkins was following Patmore's theory of time almost to the letter is treated carefully, though not definitively, but the important distinction is made that Hopkins, unlike Patmore, did not believe that time alone is measured. Hopkins did not make measure synonymous with time.

KARL SHAPIRO

The Johns Hopkins University

Le Prérromantisme, études d'histoire européenne. La Découverte de Shakespeare sur le continent. Par PAUL VAN TIEGHEM. Paris: Sfelt, 1947. Pp. xii + 412.

This book and its sequel¹ on the Romantic period constitute the last portion of the legacy bequeathed by Professor Van Tieghem to all those who are interested in comparative literature. He

¹ *L'ère romantique. Le romantisme dans la littérature européenne.* Paris, A. Michel, 1948.

shows in it that the first important criticism of Shakespeare to be written in a foreign country was the *Dissertation sur la poésie anglaise*² that appeared at The Hague in the *Journal littéraire* of 1717, but that Voltaire was the first continental to give Shakespeare's plays wide publicity. At first these were chiefly *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Romeo*, *Macbeth*, and *Lea*. The first translation of an entire play was Borck's *Julius Caesar* of 1741, the first of a series of plays was that of La Place in 1745-6, the first complete translations were those of Eschenburg in 1775-7 and of Le Tourneur in 1776-82. It was chiefly through Ducis's adaptations that certain tragedies became known in Italy, Spain, Holland, and Sweden.³ Late in the century the Germans, thanks to Lessing, Wieland, Herder, and Schlegel, rather than the French, guided continental opinion in regard to Shakespeare. The eighteenth century was little moved by the poetry of Shakespeare, but rather by his "pensées saisissantes, les traits de caractère d'une vérité profonde, plus tard la composition et le développement des caractères, la force et le mouvement de l'action."⁴ He helped to free dramatists from the consecrated rules of unity and propriety, to develop the use of national history, of bourgeois drama, of violent action, of realistic speech. His "genius" was opposed to the "taste" of the conservatives. "Génie sauvage ce mot, injure dans la bouche de Voltaire, devient éloge dans celle de Goethe."⁵

Many of these findings are not new, but it is well to have them stated in an authoritative fashion by one who had an unusually wide knowledge of the European scene and who was able to present his material in so clear and convincing a manner.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

² "On l'attribue à La Roche, réfugié français." Professor Bonno thinks that it was more probably by Van Effen.

³ Pp. 246-8.

⁴ P. 398.

⁵ P. 400. I have noted only a few errors: p. 4, for 1623 read 1632, p. 14, for 1728 read 1725, pp. 4-5, the remarks about Jussier and Nicolas Clement should be corrected in accordance with my article in the December, 1948, number of *MLN*, pp. 7-8, I am surprised to find no reference to the translation of Collier that appeared in 1715 with several references to Shakespeare, p. 237, Van T. states that Ducis's adaptation of *Hamlet* was "donnée comme de Ducis, et de lui seul," but in the *Registres* of the Comédie Française for Sept. 30, 1769, I read "Hamelet tragedie nouvelle imitée de l'anglais", p. 239, Ducis's *Roméo* is considered a tragedy that is "politique plus encore que passionnelle," though one would not infer from this statement that the principal character, old Montagu, is moved, not by political considerations, but by his passionate desire for vengeance.

Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery Volume II *A Bibliography of Emblem Books* By MARIO PRAZ London The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1947 Pp xi + 209

Delayed from publication for several years on account of the German occupation of Belgium, volume II of Prof Praz's *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery* presents us now with a bibliography of emblem books, which, announced in the foreword of volume I, completes the most detailed study of emblem literature to date. Prof Praz has assembled this bibliography from existing catalogues as well as from personal research in both private and public libraries. A list of catalogues and libraries consulted can be found on pages ix-x, where, however, we regret not to notice the following catalogues which might have contributed many items to the work under consideration: *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de M. Van der Helle*, Paris, 1863, *Catalogue des livres composant la Bibliothèque de feu M. le Baron James de Rothschild*, Paris, 1884-1920.

Prof Praz has given with commendable accuracy the full title of the book and the collation when possible, for he was unable to see all the books described. In a compact way he has also included other pertinent information such as the number of emblems and plates, the artist, the location of the book, other editions, the various translations, and their translators. When space did not permit to give all the available bibliographical details, we are conveniently guided to the appropriate reference work containing that material. Pages 180-201 concern themselves with emblems and devices for festivities, funerals, degrees, etc., pages 203-209 are devoted to a valuable index of artists.

The problem of selectivity in a work of this kind must have been difficult, for the classification of exactly what should be considered an emblem book is at times not very clearly defined. Thus items like Erasmus' *Stultitiae Laus*, Basel, 1676 with illustrations by Holbein, and many illustrated books, which, however, really belong to the literature of fables, are included, but then a note to that effect has been added by the author. Although Gracián drew many of his examples from Alciato's emblems, *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* cannot be properly listed with emblem books. It is curious to notice the omission of Ferrer de Valdecebro's *Gobierno general, moral y político hallado en las fieras y animales sylvestres*, although the same author's *Gobierno general, moral y político hallado en las aves mas generosas* is listed.

Disregarding the lacunae which inevitably occur in such a pioneering work, one may conclude that Prof Praz with this laudable volume has consolidated the material existing in private and public libraries and has rekindled an interest in this somewhat neglected branch of literature. The bibliography will serve as the foundation

and guide for future studies in a field which forms an integral part of the history of culture

KARL LUDWIG SELIG

University of Texas

American Dreams A Study of American Utopias By VERNON LOUIS PARRINGTON, JR Providence, Rhode Island Brown University Studies, Volume XI 1947 Pp viii + 234 \$4 00

Joseph Priestley and the Problem of Pantisocracy By MARY CATHRYNE PARK Philadelphia The University of Pennsylvania, 1947 Pp 60

"The initial impetus for this study," writes Mr Parrington, "was the unfinished third volume of my father's *Main Currents in American Thought*" Beginning with the writers mentioned in his father's chapter on Edward Bellamy—part of a projected section on "The Quest for Utopia"—the author extended his work "to include Bellamy's predecessors, as well as some of those who have come after"

That extension has carried him over a considerable area, from the time of John Eliot's *The Christian Commonwealth* (1659)—or earlier, if his allusions to immigration pamphlets are taken as the point of departure—to that of Franz Werfel's *Star of the Unborn* (1946) There is a place, there was a need for some such extensive survey, since previous studies, such as Robert Shurter's excellent but unpublished study, *The Utopian Novel in America, 1865-1900*, had dealt intensively with only some limited period or area of Utopian writing To have the whole range of our Utopian fiction viewed in one survey is an obvious convenience Likewise convenient, and valuable as reference, are the descriptions of a number of Utopian novels which, in themselves, are hardly required reading except for the student of some problem involving them Other passages, such as those on such colorful though secondary figures as Ignatius Donnelly, have their own intrinsic interest And still others suggest possible new fields of study, as does the brief account of publisher's policy in the section on Charles H. Kerr and Company

As the book has the values of a largely pioneer study, so it has the limitations The bibliography of Utopian fiction, as the author would readily acknowledge, could no doubt be enlarged More serious than these natural limitations is the author's failure to treat originally, or even adequately, the great Utopians George and Bellamy, and his failure to relate them or others, in a really profound and illuminating way, to the great enveloping movements of feeling and thought that run through American history

And equally serious is the occasional lapse into error or dubious

generalization For example, the summary of Howell's attitude toward social improvement closes as follows "Education will show us eventually how to effect changes in the system In the meantime there is nothing to do but remain cheerful and confident — and contribute to worthy charities" Such a passage, though it may be true to the occasional letter of Howells, does violence to the entire emphasis and spirit of a novelist one of whose main themes was the insufficiency of charity When, furthermore, Mr Pairington finds a causal relationship between "the ferment which the Utopians helped to stir up" and the attitudes of the generation "not only of Dreiser, but also of Stephen Crane, Frank Norris, Upton Sinclair, Lincoln Steffens and Edith Wharton," he is assuming that we know a great deal more than we actually do know about the workings of literary cause and effect And when he remarks that in 1885 "a social conscience was a relatively new phenomenon in the United States," the rash commitment suggests its own refutation

Notwithstanding these lapses, the book has its value as the unique presentation, in one continuous survey, of American Utopian writing extending through nearly three centuries

A quite different kind of book is Mary Cathryne Park's *Joseph Priestley and the Problem of Pantisocracy* A Pennsylvania doctoral dissertation, it studies intensively one limited problem, and does so with a maximum of documented accuracy and a minimum of dubious generalization The effect of Miss Park's study is to show that the Pantisocratic dream of the youthful Coleridge and Southey was associated with the actual settlement in Pennsylvania of Joseph Priestley and others The young men's ideas of emigration were given concrete direction by the work of Priestley's son-in-law, Thomas Cooper, in *Some Information Respecting America*, their choice of a location on the Susquehanna was the choice Cooper had already made and effected in large purchases of land. Although quoted passages underscore, as Miss Park herself does not, the contrast between the practicality of Cooper and the volatile, imaginative response of the young poets, she successfully establishes her thesis that Pantisocracy was closer to the real than has usually been thought But she has done more than just that With no apparent effort to write interestingly, she has nonetheless written interestingly And with no evident imaginative aim, she has nonetheless succeeded, by fidelity to her material and by fullness of apt quotation, in bringing vividly alive some parts of the great era of revolution in France and opportunity on the American frontier.

WALTER F TAYLOR

Blue Mountain College

Fletcher, Beaumont & Company Entertainers to the Jacobean Gentry By LAWRENCE B WALLIS New York King's Crown Press, 1947 Pp xiii + 315 \$3 75

In the first two chapters of the first section of his book, Mr Wallis traces the reputation of Beaumont and Fletcher from the extravagant esteem accorded them through most of the seventeenth century, through then practically complete loss of critical approval during the eighteenth century, to an interest reawakened in the nineteenth principally by Charles Lamb's *Specimens*. This 19th century revival is in large part a by-product of an enthusiasm for Shakespeare—an enthusiasm which, for the light then plays threw on Shakespeare's, led critics and scholars to the works of his contemporaries. In the last chapter of this section Wallis notes how Beaumont and Massinger have risen and Fletcher fallen in modern critical approval, and how Marlowe and Webster, "so long unknown, today take precedence even of Beaumont."

In the second part, Mr Wallis restudies the Beaumont and Fletcher plays in their milieu, analyzes in great detail several of the plays, and offers both a convincing explanation of their popularity in the seventeenth century and a sound estimate of their place in the history of English drama. "It was their particular point in time," Mr Wallis urges, "as much as their gentlemanly breeding, education, and social outlook, which made both Fletcher and Beaumont entertainers to the gentry in special" (p. 133). Because they were themselves gentlemen, and because both as spectators in and authors for the more aristocratic audiences of the children's company at the Blackfriars, they had learned to understand the Blackfriars' audience, and so were better able to cater to them when writing for the adult company which moved into that theatre.

The dramatists whose influence upon them is most clearly seen were those then writing for the children's company, Jonson, Chapman, Marston, and Middleton. It was, however, Shakespeare's *Pericles*, the sensational elements of which "comprise, in part, the narrative ingredients of the *Arcadia*," which, Mr Wallis thinks, "set Beaumont and Fletcher to thinking about the possibilities of romantic drama, and so to devising a tragicomic mode which would appeal to theatregoers" (p. 169). Preferring to accept Thorndike's view that *Philaster* influenced *Cymbeline*, he suggests that, even though *Cymbeline* may have been presented first, Shakespeare, in his capacity as adviser to his company, may have read the Beaumont and Fletcher play previous to composing *Cymbeline*. Even less satisfactory, I feel, is his urging, to support Thorndike's view, the theory that the two quartos of *Philaster* and the double entry, under both "*Philaster*" and "*Love lyes a bleeding*," among the fourteen plays presented at Court in 1613, suggest that there were two versions of *Philaster*, that "Fletcher (perhaps aided by Field or

another) wrote an unsatisfactory first version under the title of *Love Lies a-Bleeding*, and that Beaumont then reworked the whole play, with advice and help from his comrade, for the King's Men" (p 197). Alternate titles do not, I believe, offer prima facie evidence of revision. Further, although not noted by Mr Wallis, among the fourteen plays for which Heminge was paid are named "Much adoe aboute nothinge" and "Sir John ffalstaffe," while on the same day (20 May) the following entry records payment to Heminge for a "Benedicte and Betteris" and a "Hotspur" (Chambers, iv, 180). It is hardly likely that each of three plays was in a short season presented in two forms. Finally, as the *Philaster* of Q₂ is closer to *Cymbeline* than is that of Q₁ (the evidence for this is presented in a doctoral thesis just completed at Iowa), if the two quartos of *Philaster* represent the two versions, one before and one after *Cymbeline*, Shakespeare must have borrowed from Fletcher's original and Beaumont in his revision have borrowed from Shakespeare. Possible, but hardly probable.

Naturally Mr Wallis has comparatively little to say about the comedies in the canon, rather he stresses the tragicomedies and tragedies which have in the past provoked both the most extravagant praise and the bitterest condemnation. The critics responsible for today's general estimate of Fletcher and Beaumont achieved no historical point of view, but, prejudiced by the characteristics of their own age, failed to discover what the early seventeenth century recognized, that Fletcher and company were master craftsmen, whose "major aims as playwrights were to select piquant situations and arresting, contrasted passions from the abundant stock of these in tales and other plot-sources", to handle these technically with all the up-to-date theatrical devices they could muster, and to shape their treasure-trove to the taste of upper-class spectators, to many of whom Sidney's masterpiece was familiar. And what was this, in one sense, but a return to the tradition of the *Arcadia*?" (p 146).

No little energy and time must be consumed in consulting the 1071 footnotes arranged according to chapters at the end of the volume. Sometimes one may suspect needless annotation (*vide* note 5 in Chapter v), or wish that a system had been devised for separating those notes which contain discussion from those which merely cite reference, but Mr Wallis seems to have handled a truly terrifying amount of detail with care and accuracy.

BALDWIN MAXWELL

University of Iowa

"*Paradise Lost*" and its Critics By A J A WALDOCK Cambridge, at the University Press, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1947 Pp 147 \$2 25

To summarize and evaluate critical work on *Paradise Lost* is no easy task, especially when a scholar not only confines himself to the most challenging and controversial theories of the last thirty years, but chooses to pit against them his own equally strong opinions, and so finds himself in the vulnerable position of one who must be at the same time umpire, historian, and contestant in the field. *Paradise Lost and its Critics*, however, proves that it can be done—and done with such courtesy and good management that the book resembles nothing so much as that fine intellectual free-for-all that might have taken place if Greenlaw, Saurat, Williams, Tillyard, Lewis, and the rest had been able to sit down with the author and thrash out their differences in a common room or a faculty club.

Professor Waldock brings to this great argument a remarkably level head, a keen eye for emotional bias or logical fallacy, and a firm grasp on one essential principle: all that matters in the long run is what Milton actually succeeds in communicating to the reader. He has every respect for those who try to explain or "rescue" *Paradise Lost* by reference to the poet's humanism, "unconscious meanings," or conscious theological intentions, but he never forgets that a critic's primary concern should be with Milton's ultimate achievement. Hence, he quarrels with Lewis and Williams for assuming too readily that Milton's intentions usually justify his performance, and with Greenlaw, Saurat, Tillyard, and Miss Bodkin for holding views which necessitate forcing or over-simplification of the plain text. None of them, he feels, pays enough attention to the simple fact that Milton was in some respects an inferior technician confronted by problems which he failed to solve. In the first place, he chose a subject almost impossible to present as an extended, third-person narrative. Then, instead of playing down its intrinsic difficulties as Dante had, he enlarged and underlined them by clumsy handling. His presentation of God was tactless, his treatment of such matters as the war in heaven, the corporeality of the angels, and the nature of hell, frequently contradictory and confusing. He made the mistake of "alleging" the virtue or vice of his characters instead of "demonstrating" it, indeed, his demonstrations often gave the lie to his allegations, especially when he was dealing with Satan and Adam. No psychological tensions or theological presuppositions can justify such blunders, or do anything but help to explain why he was so blind to their nature and their consequences.

Criticism of this type is especially valuable at a time when many scholars are excitedly spinning with an and need to be sharply reminded that, to an unenchanted eye, the Emperor still *has* no clothes on. Like his opponents, however, Professor Waldock occa-

sionally drives his thesis rather hard for instance, his argument that Satan is not a successful study in progressive degeneration is much less convincing than his reasons for believing the war in heaven inconsistently imagined, few will agree that certain minor failures or discrepancies are really so serious as he evidently thinks they are, and his basic standard of judgment—the unforced response of readers to the impressions they receive—is formulated far too exclusively in terms of the *modern* reader's responses, which are not necessarily those of the audience for which *Paradise Lost* was originally intended. But even at his most debatable, Professor Waldock is always intelligent and exciting, while at his best, he offers much of great importance—a shrewd analysis of Milton's literary problems, a timely emphasis on their significance, and a discriminating appraisal of both the strengths and the weaknesses of his fellow critics. Certainly, they (and we) may all thank him, as he thanks his colleagues in his introduction, "for the clarification and stimulus that come from friendly but energetic controversy."

ELIZABETH MARIE POPE

Mills College

BRIEF MENTION

Novalis, Hymns to the Night Translated by MABEL COTTERELL with an Introduction and Appreciation by AUGUST CLOSS. London: Phoenix Press, 1948. Pp. 60. 7/6. Students of Romanticism, not able to read the somewhat difficult original, are indebted to the inspired translator, the spirited editor, and the Phoenix Press for this handsomely bound and printed slender volume of Novalis' *Hymns to the Night*. A close examination of the original and its English rendering on opposite pages shows with what facility and precision without the loss of the rhythm, verse melody, and the poetic imagery of Novalis Miss Cotterell has accomplished her task. There seems to be just one slight deviation from the text when the subjunctives "erklinge doch" and "ruften uns" (p. 52) are rendered in the indicative "far distances are ringing . . . and stars the summons singing," which could have been easily changed to "that distances were ringing . . . and stars the summons singing." With the exception of two eye-rhymes (beloved-proved, unkind-wind) there is no constraint in either syntax or vocabulary in the rhyming. The translation reads as spontaneous and fresh as the original.

Professor Closs' warm and rhapsodic introduction, packed with information and allusion, may prove somewhat difficult reading to the uninitiated if he be lacking in a knowledge of the philosophical and religious premises for the spiritual world of Novalis. He rightly

says that "Christian religion is to Novalis a religion of ecstasy" Whether the path of Novalis is the right path "for us today and above all for the Germans," as Mr Closs believes, seems to me open to doubt To be sure, "no reconstruction plans from without can rescue them from chaos" But the combination of ecstatic fervor and cool and exact scientific thinking with such a pure and childlike soul in a Novalis is an exceptional and unique phenomenon, it is perhaps the climax of German Romanticism, after which the decline sets in that leads to the dangerous social and political theory of an Adam Muller and, as Mr Closs seems to recognize on p 12, to Schopenhauer's pessimism and in the end to Wagner's pernicious music Whether the overburdening of the German mind with romantic ecstasy does not need the disciplined Goethean vision and his mentorship for a sober and unassuming socially minded activity as a collective is a grave question which the disaster of the last decades has raised for serious consideration

ERNST FEISE

The Renaissance Philosophy of Man Edited by ERNST CASSIRER, PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER, and JOHN HERMAN RANDALL, JR Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1948 Pp viii + 405 \$5 00 "The purpose of this volume is to acquaint the student of philosophy with certain major thinkers of the early Italian Renaissance through English translations of some of their more important works" (p v) To this end are offered translations of Petrarch's *On His Own Ignorance and That of Many Others*, Valla's *Dialogue on Free Will*, Ficino's *Five Questions Concerning the Mind*, Pico's *Oration on the Dignity of Man*, Pomponazzi's *On the Immortality of the Soul*, and Vives' *Fable about Man* So far as the book conforms to its stated purpose it is admirable Four of these works have not hitherto been available in English, and prior translations of the other two are not readily accessible The translations are, without exception, sound Some may be checked not only against the original but against versions in other languages (*e g* the Edizione Nazionale of Pico), such a check reveals the illuminating care exercised by the present translators The resultant text is of value not only to students of philosophy but to all students of the Renaissance

Vives does not fall within "the early Italian Renaissance" and his inclusion accentuates the book's tendency toward miscellany The space might have been given to something by Pietro d'Abano or perhaps to Pico's letter to Ermalao Barbaro, and Vives reserved for a succeeding volume of sixteenth century selections A more noticeable departure from the avowed purpose of acquaintance through translation is the insertion of a general introduction to the volume plus an introductory essay for each text, which results

in 72 pages of essay for 298 pages of text. The compression necessitated in the essays themselves is not without danger. Such a statement as "The teaching of the medieval Italian universities was scientific and often anticlerical in its interests, and to such interests the Humanists were opposing their own religious and moral aims," (p. 4) is likely to be misinterpreted by students whose ideas are still drawn primarily from Burckhardt and Symonds. The remedy is reference to the articles, cited in the bibliography, wherein the several editors have adduced the supporting evidence and made the requisite qualifications and exceptions. With such supplemental reading this volume becomes an important contribution to a concept of the Renaissance now only beginning to take form among scholars whose primary concern is with the literature or art of the period.

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

The Johns Hopkins University

Matthew Arnold A Study By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. Pp. 144, including genealogical chart and index. \$3.50. Although this volume appeared over a year ago, it has received almost no attention in scholarly journals. Professor Basil Willey in the *London Spectator* (Oct. 10, 1947) with some justification calls it "an unpretending book" that was probably a "labour of love," a "pareigon thrown off by a great scholar long distinguished in other fields." It offers no decidedly new illumination of Arnold or his works and fails to consider the arguments of a good many recent studies; moreover the author admits that there are collections of material, notably at Yale, which he has not been able to consult. Yet the book should not be completely ignored, for it presents judicious conclusions that have matured during quite a few years of sympathetic interest in Arnold.

The work consists primarily of compact and lucid biographical narrative, supported by concisely developed evidence. The chapters on "The Public Servant" and "The Professor" embody a certain amount of information not readily obtainable elsewhere and are on the whole more satisfying than those on "The Poet" and "The Philosopher." The last mentioned chapter does little more than summarize Arnold's prose works dealing with religious, social, and political questions; it makes slight effort to discuss their terms, concepts, and method of argument. Statements concerning Arnold's literary criticism, to be found scattered throughout the volume, are of the same limited nature. In the chapter on "The Poet" the commentaries upon individual poems are much less detailed than those in the study by Professors Tinker and Lowry, though some suggest corrections of that study. More often than not, these

commentaries deal only with the relationship of the poems to biographical incidents. The reader will find in the volume no thorough analyses of poems or prose works as literary structures.

The fact remains that this study may well prove a useful introductory discussion, to be read by students prior to analyzing the more complex and provocative interpretations of Arnold's personality, thought, and art by Professors Tilling and E. K. Brown.

LLOYD DAVIDSON

The Johns Hopkins University

A Bibliography of William Dean Howells By WILLIAM M. GIBSON and GEORGE ARMS. New York: The New York Public Library, 1948. Pp. 182. \$2.25. Reprinted with revisions and additions from issues of the *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library (1946-47), this compilation includes a checklist of Howells' works and partial works, and of his contributions to periodicals, newspapers, and "departments" (5 pp.), a collation of this material (142 pp.), brief in form, and a selected list of critical writings on Howells—some 250 items from a total of about 800 examined. It supplies four illustrations, an identification of Howells' pseudonyms, and is concluded by a name index which lists the illustrators of Howells' books and magazine pieces.

The original aim to include all Howells' published writings was modified by war conditions, and English editions and foreign translations have been omitted. Purposely excluded are "books of reprinted material issued without Howell's editorial direction," though such items are noted in the preface. Although a great many unsigned periodical items may not have been identified, many were examined, the preface states, and discarded as not indubitably by Howells. The listing begins with verses published in the *Ohio State Journal* in 1852, and concludes with the nine items published in the last year of his life and the few posthumously issued pieces. During the 68 years of continuous authorship, the compilers note, "about 200 books wholly or in part by Howells and 1200 periodical pieces were published." The establishment of the Howells canon therefore is important. Attention might here be drawn to the fact that no collection of Howells' writing has been published, and that many of his letters (including his diplomatic correspondence) still remain in manuscript.

The user of the *Bibliography* should read the preface with attention. It sets forth the method of selection and collation, and serves admirably as a model of procedure for those who, one hopes, will undertake similar bibliographies of major writers.

THOMAS H. JOHNSON

Lawrenceville, New Jersey

The Satiric and Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy By HELENA WATTS BAUM Chapel Hill, N C University of North Carolina Press, 1947 Pp vi + 192 \$3 50 The virtue of this book is its analysis of the stages by which Jonson evolved a dramatic technique that was at once comic, satiric, and didactic This analysis does not come until the final chapter, the earlier chapters, therefore, dealing with Jonson's theory of comic poetry and cataloguing the chief objects of his satire, are unnecessarily long and prevent the proper emphasis being accorded to the principal contribution of the author's study Since Jonson's theory of comedy required that a play be essentially serious and didactic in content, the satirizing of human follies and vices inevitably becomes integral to his comic method. Mrs Baum traces Jonson's experiments to achieve a technique that would be a perfect balance and fusion of thought-provoking content, mordant satire, and comic gaiety, so that the element of moral instruction in his plays would not detract from their effectiveness as theatrical entertainment She shows how his earlier attempts in *The Case Is Altered*, *Every Man in His Humour*, *Every Man out of His Humour*, *Cynthia's Revels*, and *Poetaster* fell short of his goal Finally, in *Volpone*, Jonson mastered the playwright's craft by discovering how to give full expression to the didactic content of his plays by devices peculiar to the art of the theater Realizing that he must delight in order to teach, he worked out, by trial and error, the dramatic technique best suited to accomplish his artistic purpose

FRANCIS R JOHNSON

Stanford University

Troilus and Criseyde By GEOFFREY CHAUCER Extracts selected and edited by GEORGES BONNARD Bern [1943]. 104 pp Fr 4 80 [\$1 50]. This edition of the *Troilus*, obviously designed for non-English-speaking students, carries on the grim Continental tradition of heavy emphasis on linguistic matters to the exclusion of all else The text (85 pages) is based on Root's, but the editor has departed from it frequently by restoring the ψ readings whenever he feels that they are closer to Chaucer's own writing of the poem Variant readings at the bottom of the page make possible a careful study of the text and eight pages of explanatory notes plus eight of glossary aid in the exegesis It is discouraging, however, to find in this edition of a major poet no attempt whatsoever to discuss the literary qualities of the poem or even to call attention to their existence Assuredly a brief bibliography would be especially useful to the students for whom this work is intended, but all they will find here are the titles of Brunner's and Jordan's grammars, the Robinson, Root, and Skeat texts, and Ten Brink's *Sprache und Verskunst*. Probably no two individuals would agree on precisely what parts of the poem should be excerpted for a text of this sort,

but, in general, the editor has chosen well and has provided brief prose summaries to suggest the continuity of the poem. It is difficult, however, to understand his omitting one of the most impressive passages in the *Troilus*, its conclusion

THOMAS A. KIRBY

Louisiana State University

Adam: Bremensis Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum, Codex Havniensis, published in photolithography with preface by C. A. CHRISTENSEN. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1948. Pp. xvi + 130. This facsimile edition of the Copenhagen codex of Adam of Bremen is a welcome addition to our all too limited stock of medieval Latin publications. As Professor Christensen points out in his preface, students of Adam's book will now be able to compare Schmeidler's text with the text as recorded in one of the oldest MSS. The codex now made available to us is not only old, it is our chief source of information for the C branch of the MS tradition. The editor gives us a concise and carefully reasoned study of the C class, and is able to throw much new light on the subject and clear up a number of doubtful points. In particular, he shows that this class of MSS goes back to a copy of Adam of Bremen's work which reached Denmark between the years 1805 and 1180. This copy is no longer in existence, but many if not most of its characteristic readings have come down to us, chiefly in the Copenhagen codex (Schmeidler's C₁). Editor and publishers alike are to be congratulated on this book.

K. M.

The Cycles of the Kings. By MYLES DILLON. London and New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1946. Pp. viii + 124. \$3.25. This is a book of selections from the historical sagas of Old Ireland (excluding the Ulster cycle, already known to the general public). The editor has himself made the translations into English, the Irish texts are not given, for "the book is intended not primarily for Irish scholars, but rather for the larger public" (p. v). Professor Dillon happily combines scholarly competence with a good English style and sensitive literary taste. His little volume is an admirable example of its kind, and can be warmly recommended.

K. M.

Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers, 1300-1500 By LAURA KEELER Berkeley Univ of California Press, 1946 viii + 151 \$1 75 This study falls into four main parts (1) authors who "draw freely upon Geoffrey of Monmouth without questioning his reliability", (2) authors who "draw freely upon Geoffrey but question certain passages", (3) authors who, "though they do not explicitly question Geoffrey's reliability, draw upon him for a specific purpose only, usually political", and (4) authors who, "conscious of the fictitious character of the *Historia*, expose the true nature of its fables" (pp vii, viii) Under each head Miss Keeler takes up the individual chronicles and specifies how the chronicler used Geoffrey as a source what he took, what he left out, what changes he made She adds three pages of summary statement of her finds by way of conclusion This is followed by 20 pages of notes, five appendices, a bibliography, and an index We have here a solid and useful piece of work

K M

Initiation pratique à l'anglais By ANDRÉ MARTINET IAC, Rue Victor-Lagrange, Lyon, 1947 Pp 315 = Collection "Les Langues du Monde" publiée sous la direction de Henri Hierche Série enseignement pratique Volume I In this practical introduction to the English language the author prints three texts *Lispeth* by Rudyard Kipling, *Sirpence* by Katherine Mansfield, and *The Worst Crime in the World* by G K Chesterton He breaks these stories up in small pieces, suitable for a lesson, annotating each of them for grammar, pronunciation, and meaning At the end of the book there is an index of words with references to the notes of each lesson, and a short systematic grammar The experiment is interesting for its attempt to plunge the student headlong into interesting prose texts of the foreign language It seems to be done with care.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

Monroe's Defense of Jefferson and Freneau against Hamilton Edited by PHILIP M MARSH. (Oxford, Ohio, privately printed, 1948 Pp 56, \$1 50) This pamphlet's main value is not so much in Mr Marsh's account of the Freneau controversy, which is rather confusing, as in the fact that it contains extensive excerpts from Hamilton's charges, and, what is more valuable, the text of the six essays comprising the "Vindication of Mr Jefferson" Thus much material, otherwise difficult to find, is conveniently assembled in one place Mr Marsh cites two of Monroe's letters to show that Monroe

wrote part of the "Vindication" He believes that Madison wrote the rest (accounting, if Mr Marsh is right, for such a large part of the total that one wonders why Madison's name is excluded from the pamphlet's title), and that Madison and Monroe had much the better of the controversy with Hamilton

CHARLES S CAMPBELL, JR

The Johns Hopkins University

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CENSUS OF MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE MANUSCRIPTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, compiled by the late Seymour De Ricci with the assistance of W J Wilson and published in two volumes in 1935 and '37, with Index volume in 1940, is now outdated A *Supplement* to the *Census* is now being prepared under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies with C U Faye of the University of Illinois Library Staff as editor The *Supplement* will contain descriptions of manuscripts not listed in the *Census* and amplifications and emendations of entries in the *Census* The *Supplement* will, as the *Census* did, exclude from its scope manuscripts written after 1600, Oriental manuscripts, papyri and epigraphic material Material to be included in the *Supplement* should, if possible, reach the editor by 1 May 1949

C U FAYE

P O Box 395
Champaign, Illinois

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

APRIL, 1949

Number 4

EROS AND PSYCHE A NIETZSCHEAN MOTIF IN ANGLO-AMERICAN LITERATURE

Heine's poem *Psyche* is well known

In der Hand die kleine Lampe,
In der Brust die große Glut,
Schleicht Psyche zu dem Lager,
Wo der holde Schlafer ruht
Sie eriotet und sie zittert,
Wie sie seine Schönheit sieht—
Der enthüllte Gott der Liebe,
Er erwacht und er entflieht
Achtzehnhundertjahr'ge Buße'
Und die Armste stirbt beinah'
Psyche fastet und kasteit sich,
Weil sie Amorn nackend sah

This poem of Heine's, together with others like *Die Beschwörung*, *Auf diesem Felsen bauen wir*, *Der Tannhauser* and many passages from his prose works, contrasts the pagan and Christian views of sex. Paganism knows nothing of the stigma which Christianity has put on the sex act, nor of the sublimation which the sex instinct has undergone under the impact of Christian spirituality. The distinction between lower and higher, or profane and sacred, love, which we recognize in everyday thinking, is a manifestation of Christian dualism and is alien to the harmony between body and soul which paganism has always striven to attain. As long as love is naive, instinctive, frankly sexual, man is happy. Once it becomes conscious, intellectual, spiritualized, he loses his peace of mind and develops a sense of guilt towards life in general.

It is perhaps not altogether idle to point out, even to a *Germanist*, that these ideas are part of a deep intellectual current which

has become central in German thought of the last two centuries the conflict between paganism and Christianity which, in a sense, dominates German literature from the *Aufklärung* to the present day. But no one has been as influential in shaping the pagan tradition in German thought as Heine and Nietzsche. In their writings we find the clearest, fullest and most vigorous statement of the issues involved and through them the tradition has spread into non-German literature in two successive waves.¹

What are these issues? The neo-pagan believes that man is faced with a choice between two *Weltanschauungen* which are diametrically opposed to each other and which allow of no compromise. The one affirms life on this earth in all its aspects, with its joys and sorrows, its pleasures and pains. Life is desirable even at its bitterest, the very destructive forces in nature testify to her eternal fertility and creativeness. Dionysos, cut to pieces, will be reborn again, this is the central mystery in the pagan religion.

In contrast, the Christian conception of life is altogether otherworldly, *jenseitig*. Nietzsche is the most outspoken of the German pagans, he accuses Christianity of the deepest crimes against the spirit of man, against nature herself. By seeking to curb man's instincts, especially his will to power and self-development, Christianity condemns him to a life of gloom, of joyless asceticism, of spiritual impoverishment and frustration, to a life which is death. The pagan virtues are those which further the development of man's chthonic forces: the aristocratic principle,² physical beauty

¹ Heine's "Hellenism and Hebraism" is taken over by Matthew Arnold, who gives it a characteristically Victorian twist, from Arnold it goes to the Powys brothers. The influence of Heine's pagan doctrine (itself deriving from the French Saint Simonians) on the Parnassians and on Baudelaire should be investigated.

² A brief summary like the one offered here is bound to oversimplify a complex situation. What is here referred to as "the pagan tradition" is anything but a cut and dried body of dogmas, it is a "tradition," which has grown and developed and changed its orientation in accordance with the prevailing *Zeitgeist*. Thus Heine's paganism is not aristocratic, like Nietzsche's, on the contrary, it is Christian and democratic. "Wir stiften eine Demokratie gleichherrlicher, gleichheiliger, gleichseliger Gotter" (*Werke* (ed. Welzel), VII, 266). Heine's attempt to combine democracy with paganism is an aberration into which he may have been led by the political fashion of the day. The two are incompatible. (Cf. Thomas Mann's essay *Goethe und Tolstoy*.) Or is this an expression of the dualism that was forever raging in Heine's soul? See Miss E. M. Butler's sug-

and prowess, pride, courage, war, Christianity promotes what Emerson called the restrictive or self-effacing virtues humility, self-sacrifice, pity, equality, peace, universal brotherhood. The mission of Christianity has been to transcend the bounds which nature imposes on man. Instinct versus intellect, *Natur* versus *Geist*, the unconscious versus conscious cerebration these are the polarities in the pagan-Christian conflict.

Our special interest narrows down to three aspects of the pagan philosophy its attitude to the body, to woman and to sex. Paganism emphasizes the physical side of life, the senses, the flesh, the appetites, these are not only good in themselves, but through them life receives its fullest meaning. Wedekind's paradox "*Das Fleisch hat seinen eigenen Geist*" is the perfect motto for neo-paganism. Reference need only be made at this point to Heine's essay *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland*, to the section *Von den Verachtern des Leibes* in Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* and to Wedekind's Novelle *Rabbi Esia*.

The harsh attitude which modern paganism adopts towards woman is a natural corollary of the aristocratic principle. With an eye on D. H. Lawrence, one may say that Nietzsche anticipates the Strindbergian thesis of a perpetual struggle for power between the sexes and that he is unequivocally on the side of the poor, downtrodden male. Modern woman has been pampered by the Christian-democratic ideals of Rousseau and the French Revolution, she is in rebellion against the state of servitude which is natural to her and her revolt heralds the destruction of European civilization.

There is one other motif in this general complex of ideas that make up the pagan view of life. Again the source seems to be Heine. In the essay *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland* he writes

Die nächste Aufgabe ist, gesund zu werden, denn wir fühlen uns noch sehr schwach in den Gliedern. Die heiligen Vampire des Mittelalters haben uns so viel Lebensblut ausgesaugt. Und dann müssen der Materie noch große Subnopfer geschlachtet werden, damit sie die alten Beleidigungen verzeihe. Es wäre sogar ratsam, wenn wir Festspiele anordneten, und der Materie noch mehr außerordentliche Entschädigungs-Ehren erwiesen. Denn das Christentum, unfähig die Materie zu vernichten, hat sie überall fletiert, es hat die edelsten Genüsse herabgewürdigt, und die Sinne mußten heucheln und

gestive discussion of Heine in her book *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany* (Cambridge, 1935)

es entstand Lüge und Sünde Die Materie wird nur alsdann böse, wenn sie heimlich konspizieren muß gegen die Usurpationen des Geistes, wenn der Geist sie flettiert hat und sie sich aus Selbstverachtung prostituiert, oder wenn sie gar mit Verzweiflungshass sich an dem Geiste rächt, und somit wird das Übel nur ein Resultat der spiritualistischen Welteinrichtung³

The medieval Church transformed the old pagan gods into Christian devils, turned Olympus into Hell and, as the Tannhäuser legend shows, made the goddess Venus a special target of ecclesiastical zeal Nietzsche repeats this idea many times in his writings —most succinctly in § 76 of *Morgenröthe*

Böse denken heißt böse machen —Die Leidenschaften werden böse und tückisch, wenn sie böse und tückisch betrachtet werden So ist es dem Christentum gelungen, aus Eros und Aphrodite —großen idealfähigen Mächten —hollische Kobolde und Truggeister zu schaffen, durch die Mätern, welche es in dem Gewissen der Gläubigen bei allen geschlechtlichen Erregungen entstehen ließ Die Zeugung des Menschen mit dem bösen Gewissen verschwistern! — Zuletzt hat diese Veriteufelung des Eros einen Komodien Ausgang bekommen der "Teufel" Eros ist allmählich den Menschen interessanter als alle Engel und Heiligen geworden, Dank der Munkerei und Geheimtueren der Kirche in allen erotischen Dingen sie hat bewirkt, bis in unsere Zeiten hinein, daß die Liebesgeschichte das einzige wirkliche Interesse wurde, das allen Kreisen gemein ist, — in einer dem Altertum unbegreiflichen Übertreibung, der später einmal auch noch das Gelächter nachfolgen wird

And an aphorism in *Jenseits von Gut und Böse* (§ 168) sums up the whole matter "Das Christentum gab dem Eros Gift zu trinken —er starb zwar nicht daran, aber entartete, zum Laster"

The pagan-Christian conflict, in the formulation which Heine and Nietzsche gave it, is widespread in European and American literature from the later nineteenth century to the present The present study is restricted to an investigation of two writers the English novelist D. H. Lawrence and the American playwright Eugene O'Neill.

2

Lawrence's acquaintance with Nietzsche goes back to his teaching days E. T., the friend of his youth, records in her memoir of him that Lawrence discovered Nietzsche in the library at Croydon and began to talk about the will to power in a way which convinced her that he had come upon something new and engrossing Lawrence

³ Heine *Werke*, VII, 263-4

himself, in one of his earliest stories (which is obviously autobiographical) * mentions Nietzsche as one of the authors who had formed his mind. What had Nietzsche to offer Lawrence? The answer is everything.

The similarity in temperament and mental fibre between the two men is striking. Lawrence's passionate, fanatical iconoclasm, his whole-hearted belief in the power of ideas is strongly reminiscent of Nietzsche. Indeed Lawrence's *literal* belief in the mysteries of sun and moon worship and, above all, in the mystery of sex, have a distinctly German flavor about them. One thinks of Holderlin and his gods, of Winckelmann the latter-day Greek, of Stefan George of the Munich period.

Lawrence espouses Nietzsche's irrationalism to a degree that would have embarrassed the master. His hatred of *Aufklärung* is so extreme as to appear petulant and childish. Enlightenment, as embodied in modern science, meant for Lawrence the destruction of the mystery that is life, because it diminishes man's sense of wonder and blunts his sensitiveness.⁵ "My great religion," Lawrence wrote to a friend, "is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says is always true. The intellect is only a bit and a bridle. What do I care about knowledge? All I want is to answer to my blood, direct, without fribbling intervention of mind, or moral or what not."⁶ Lawrence's eternal lament is that "ours is an excessively conscious age, we know so much, we feel so little." He echoes Nietzsche's contempt for our modern Alexandrinism: "wir haben keine Bildung, nur ein Wissen um die Bildung."⁷ "Culture and civilization," writes Lawrence in *Apocalypse*, "are tested by vital consciousness. Are we more vitally conscious than an Egyptian three thousand years ago? Our conscious range is wide but shallow as a sheet of paper. We have no depth to our consciousness. . . . Our culture cannot understand the ancient cult-lore, because culture is an activity of the mind,

* *A Modern Lover* (London, 1934), p. 19.

⁵ Aldous Huxley, Introduction to *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence* (London, 1932), p. xiv.

⁶ Quoted in J. W. Cunliffe, *English Literature in the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1933), p. 215.

⁷ *Vom Nutzen und Nachtheil der Historie für das Leben* § 4.

cult-lore an activity of the senses"⁸ And, like Nietzsche, Lawrence finds in Socrates the fountain-head of Western intellectualism, that is decadence

They are at one also in their attitude to power and democracy In the *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine* and in many of his essays, Lawrence labors the familiar argument that Nature is full of cruelty, inequality, favoring the principles of aristocracy Progress is possible only if the principle of power is allowed to dominate, when the strong conquers the weak "The terms higher and lower, as applied to civilizations, mean being endowed with greater or lesser will to power" Democracy destroys the natural, organic hierarchy on which all society should be based with the few individuals on top and the mass of nonentities ministering to the needs of these superior few For this natural order democracy substitutes the rule of the many, who are an aggregate of fragments, each of which falsely thinks itself a whole individuality⁹

Lawrence is as violent an enemy of Christianity as Nietzsche, and pretty much for the same reasons He makes Christianity principally responsible for the many evils from which modern man suffers For him, as for Nietzsche, Christianity is essentially the spirit of democracy Its central doctrine of love for all men is inimical to the development of personality in those few who have a potential personality to develop By focussing attention on the "thou," Christianity has destroyed the "I" On the other hand, it fosters the growth of individuality in the masses, who have only the tiniest touch of individuality in their make-up These lower orders, whom Nietzsche called "die Fabrikware der Natur," are taught to cultivate envy and hatred of their betters, to assume an attitude of self-righteousness, self-conceit, self-importance.¹⁰

3.

Our main interest, however, is in those three aspects of the pagan *Weltanschauung* which were singled out earlier in this paper its attitude to the body, to sex, and to the degradation of the sexual instinct by Christianity

⁸ *Apocalypse* (London, 1932), pp 83, 85

⁹ *Ibid.*, p 218

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p 210

In a striking essay, entitled *The Risen Lord*,¹⁰ Lawrence uses Christ as a symbol for three possible attitudes to life within Christianity itself. The Jesus whom we celebrate at Christmas, the Christ child in the lap of the Virgin Mary, is the symbol of man as the guileless innocent child, sheltered in the arms of his loving and protecting mother. At Easter, more specifically on Good Friday, we celebrate another Christ, the Crucified Lord, standing alone in this world, abandoned and betrayed by His fellow men. He is the prototype of the young men who fought in World War I, who stood beyond the help of wife or mother, for whom the protected Christ child had lost all meaning. And now, concludes Lawrence, a third generation is growing up. These young men cannot go back to the idyllic Christ child, but neither can they remain in the purely negative attitude of the Crucified Christ. They need a new symbol, a positive way of life. And Lawrence offers them the figure of the resurrected Christ of Easter Sunday. This is Christ risen again, not merely in the spirit, but in the flesh, become man again with all that the word implies.

He rises with hands and feet, as Thomas knew for certain, and if with hands and feet, then with lips and stomach and genitals of a man. Christ risen, and risen in the whole of His flesh, not with some left out. If Jesus rose as a full man, in full flesh and soul, then He rose to take a woman to Himself, to live with her, and to know the tenderness and blossoming of the twoness with her. He who had been hitherto so limited to His oneness, or His universality, which is the same thing. If Jesus rose in the full flesh, He rose to know the tenderness of a woman, and the great pleasure of her, and to have children by her. If Jesus rose a full man in the flesh, He rose to continue His fight with the hard-boiled conventionalists like Roman judges and Jewish priests and money makers of every sort. But this time it would no longer be the fight of self-sacrifice that would end in crucifixion. This time it would be a freed man fighting to shelter the rose of life from being trampled on by the pigs.¹¹

This third conception of Christianity's message becomes the basis of Lawrence's beautiful Novelle *The Man Who Died*, which is perhaps the most daring treatment of the life of Christ in all literature. This tale, like George Moore's *The Brook Kerith*, tells the story of Jesus after the crucifixion. Jesus does not die on the cross, He awakens to life in His tomb and goes out into the world alone. He lives with poor peasants until He is strong enough to resume

¹⁰ *Assorted Articles* (London, 1930), p. 105 ff.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111 ff.

His wanderings on earth. As He reviews His first life on earth, He realizes that His whole teaching was false. His message of selfless love, of self-sacrifice for others was a mistake. Henceforth He will live for Himself apart from others, and strive to realize His own potentialities of character. He will no longer seek to convert His fellow men, because the missionary spirit is a form of compulsion and therefore of intolerance, which violates the rights of others to their own personality. Above all, He will allow His body those rights which He had denied it in His previous existence. He will seek a woman whom he can love sexually without thereby losing his own identity.

After some time He comes to a temple of Isis, presided over by a beautiful virgin priestess, who is waiting for the risen god Osiris to fulfil her destiny. The unknown wanderer stills her as no man before Him has done, she feels "in her blood" that this is the Osiris for whom she has been waiting. Their physical union concludes the conversion to paganism which Jesus has been undergoing since His resurrection. He is convinced that His former teaching "blessed are they that mourn" was mistaken, for He now sees life as a supreme value. The love which He offered men and which He demanded from them in turn was a dead love. "Perhaps" He muses, "Judas loved me in the flesh and I willed that he should love me bodilessly, with the corpse of love"¹². For there had dawned on Him the reality of the soft warm love which is in touch and which is full of delight. And when He is threatened with a second martyrdom, He refuses to face the prospect, for now He has something to live for. So He leaves the priestess behind Him and sets out on a new journey in joy and hope.

It is clear from this literary "commentary" on the earlier essay, that Lawrence's use of the risen pagan Christ as a symbol within the Christian mythology is merely a polemic device, a Christian weapon turned against Christianity itself. For Lawrence, like Nietzsche, is convinced that Christianity and paganism will always be mortal enemies and he has no hesitancy in choosing sides in the feud. There are scores of passages in Lawrence's works, in which his hostility to Christianity is open and uncompromising.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine Lawrence's complicated metaphysic of sex. After treating the sexual relationship

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 127

between man and woman from many different angles and giving various solutions to the conflict between the sexes, Lawrence arrives, in his last novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, at a view which might well be summed up in Wedekind's formula "Das Fleisch hat seinen eigenen Geist"

More central to our investigation is Lawrence's treatment of the "degradation" motif the contention that Christianity has turned healthy sex into something devilish, and the consequences of this degradation In Lawrence's writings this defilement of the sacred mystery of sex occurs almost exclusively in the form of the cold, heartless promiscuity that was practised by the youth of the "lost generation," those who came to manhood shortly after the First World War In the novel *Women in Love* it is the group of Bohemians whom Gerald Crich meets in London, in *Aaron's Rod* it is the Bricknell set, in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the week-end visitors at Wragby Lawrence is savage in his denunciation of this depravity Sex as a cocktail, licentiousness because it is smart, the body as a toy to play with all this he hates Equally intense is his hatred of Don Juanerie, wearisome philandering, that comes from coldness of heart, whereas true sex is warm-hearted, fired by the flame of life All obscenity and pornography is, in Lawrence's view, a degradation of sex and springs from a Puritanical conception of sex as something to be suppressed The Puritan who has practised repression of sex for years falls into sexual indecency in advanced age

4.

If Lawrence takes over the Nietzschean "system" in its entirety, O'Neill may be said to touch Nietzsche only at one point on the question of sex¹⁸ Otherwise O'Neill is a Christian in the Nietzschean sense of the word One segment of O'Neill's work, however, is devoted to problems arising out of the Puritan attitude to sex, it comprises the three plays *The Great God Brown*, *Lazarus Laughed* and *Mourning Becomes Electra* In all three O'Neill uses the mask as a symbol for Puritan repression, it is an artificial attempt to conceal our real nature which approves the sex instinct as the purest manifestation of the creative impulse O'Neill first

¹⁸ For O'Neill's relation to Nietzsche, see Sophus Keith Winther *Eugene O'Neill, A Critical Study* New York 1934, *passim*—The term "Puritan" is used by O'Neill himself in the loose sense of "puritanical"

treats the Heine-Nietzsche theme fully in *The Great God Brown*. Mr. Joseph Wood Krutch, in his introduction to the Modern Library edition of O'Neill's plays, complains that this is the most puzzling of all O'Neill's dramas. But there is really little about it that is obscure. It depicts the pagan-Christian conflict on the problem of sex. Pure paganism is embodied in Cybel or Cybele, Mother Earth, who is also nature, instinct, naive sex without consciousness of guilt. She loves life for its own sake, does not exploit it for some "higher" end. Her panacea for the sufferings of modern humanity is the same as Lawrence's: "I'd like to run out naked into the street," she says, "and love the whole mob to death like I was bringing you a new brand of dope that'd make you forget everything that ever was for good!"¹⁴ But Puritan bourgeois society is ridden by a guilt complex, which seeks liberation from its own crimes in a scapegoat and always finds one in the Dionysian pagan, who lives in innocent sensuality.¹⁵

Cybel's direct antagonist is the successful business man Billy Brown, a literary half-cousin of Thomas Mann's Hans Hansen, a spiritual fraud, who gains his successes by exploiting the genius of his life-long friend Dion Anthony. Brown not only steals Anthony's brains, but kills his friend and marries the latter's wife, trying to pass himself off as Anthony the Dionysian genius. Brown is at first an out and out philistine, a veritable pillar of bourgeois respectability, especially in matters of sex. But the sex instinct, which is the instinct of life itself, refuses to be thwarted, even by a Puritan. And so the great god Brown pays his regular visits to Cybel the prostitute. "Das Christentum gab dem Eros Gift zu trinken, er starb zwar nicht daran, aber entartete, zum Lasten." Gradually, in his years of association with Dion Anthony, he gains insight into the superiority of the pagan ideal and tries himself to become a pagan. But it is only on his deathbed that he realizes the basic principle of life that makes pagan happiness possible, and it is Cybele who teaches it to him.

Brown What's the prayer you taught me—Our Father—?

Cybel Our Father who art!

Brown Who art! Who art! I know! I have found Him! I hear Him speak! "Blessed are they that weep, for they shall laugh!" Only he that

¹⁴ *Nine Plays* (Modern Library), p. 337

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 372

has wept can laugh! The laughter of Heaven sows earth with a rain of tears, and out of Earth's transfigured birth-pain the laughter of Man returns to bless and play again in innumerable dancing gales of flame upon the knees of God (He dies) ¹⁶

What is the end of life, according to O'Neill? Not success, not material happiness, but the acceptance of life in its entirety as desirable Nietzsche's Dionysian *Weltanschauung*

Between these two protagonists of opposing philosophies stands the higher type of modern man, represented by Dion Anthony. In Anthony's soul there is a perpetual conflict between pagan acceptance of life and Christian masochism (the term is O'Neill's), the whole struggle resulting in exhaustion and frustration. Dion's life is ruined by the Puritan society in which he lives, whose negative ideals have so deeply permeated his being, that his creative spirit is stifled. It seeks vengeance on society through cynicism and Satanism. As Dion himself says: "When Pan was forbidden the light and warmth of the sun, he grew sensitive and self-conscious and proud and revengeful and became the Prince of Darkness" ¹⁷

In the light of this interpretation, the meaning of O'Neill's next play—*Lazarus Laughed*—becomes clear. The theme is once more the pagan joy in life, in the whole of life, in conflict with the Christian denial of existence on this earth. The play forms a striking parallel to Lawrence's story *The Man Who Died*. Lazarus, brought back to life after spending four days in the tomb, has overcome the fear of death which rules all men and which lies at the root of all asceticism. There is no death, Lazarus now proclaims, only life, no sorrow, only laughter. And his laughter is so infectious that it converts everyone who hears it, even the most corrupt and degenerate Romans, but only temporarily, as long as Lazarus is there. For no one really believes in his pagan laughter, neither the Puritanical Jews, nor the degenerate Romans, least of all the immediate followers of Christ. Only the Greek throng in Athens recognizes Lazarus for what he is—the god Dionysos risen again.

In *Mourning Becomes Electra* O'Neill once more comes to grips with the pagan-Christian conflict. That, it seems to me, is the new content which he has poured into the old Greek myth. Those who

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 374

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 348

see in the trilogy nothing but a restatement of the old Greek theme in psychoanalytic terms are mistaken. The psychoanalysis is merely a modern vehicle for carrying the theme—so much is true. But the tragic conflict itself is the attempt of Christine Mannon and her two children, Lavinia and Orin, to shake off the Puritan, Christian, Mannon inheritance. The Mannons all have mask-like faces, O'Neill tells us in the stage directions, we know what that means in O'Neill: the mask is used by the Puritan to conceal his natural instincts, especially as regards sex. These natural instincts would like to affirm life as desirable, but the Puritan is afraid of life and seeks death even in life. "Why are you talking of death?" Christine asks her husband Ezra Mannon. He replies: "That's always been the Mannons' way of thinking. They went to the white meeting-house on Sabbaths and meditated on death. Life was a dying. Being born was starting to die. Death was being born."¹⁸

The series of catastrophes which stalk the House of Mannon are caused by repeated attempts to thwart the natural expression of the sex instinct. As the mask is the symbol of Puritan repression, so there is a symbol for pagan joy—the blessed isles in the South Seas, whose natives live in a state of original innocence, because they have never heard that love is a sin. These isles are mentioned repeatedly in the trilogy, those members of the family who wish to shake off the Mannon inheritance dream of life on the blessed isles: Adam Brant, Christine, Orin, and even Lavinia in her later metamorphosis.

Pagan joy in life, as manifested in the free expression of sex, Christian hostility to life, as expressed in the suppression of sex, the revenge which the sex instinct takes on the Puritan Christian by degrading sex into vile lust—that is the triad of ideas which Lawrence, O'Neill and other modern writers have taken over from German thought, through Nietzsche.

H. STEINHAEUER

University of Manitoba

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 738

KEATS'S "O FOR A LIFE OF SENSATIONS" 1"

Except for the "Beauty is truth" verses in the *Ode on a Grecian Urn*, no words that Keats wrote have been more provocative than his fervent ejaculation in 1817 "O for a life of sensations rather than of thoughts!"¹ That the words meant much to Keats no one will deny, they summed up his aesthetic creed at the time. But unfortunately there is little certainty as to what the words mean. Critics in general fall into three groups: those who are puzzled or noncommittal, those who regret or deplore, and those who revise in order to clarify or (as it sometimes seems) to purify.

It is not often, in these times, that Keats's words are linked with B. R. Haydon's story of the poet's painting his tongue and throat with cayenne pepper in order to enjoy the "delicious coldness of claret in all its glory."² Few give credence to this story today,³ but the interpretation that many critics now assign to Keats's exclamation suggests that there is an earnest desire to rescue the poet from the imputation of an excessive sensuousness. Though Matthew Arnold frankly admitted that "a life of sensations" meant the "sole dominion of sense," he persuaded himself that Keats overcame this weakness and developed a non-sensuous, "intellectual and spiritual" love of beauty.⁴ Others have glossed "sensations" in a way that eliminates all reference to sense-activity. Keats did not mean what he wrote, they contend, he meant "intuitive perceptions of the higher nature" (A. E. Hancock),⁵ "intuitions of the mind and spirit" (Sidney Colvin),⁶ "intuition" (Ernest de Sélincourt),⁷ "intuitions of the mind" (C. D. Thorpe),⁸

¹ Letter 31, p. 68, *The Letters of John Keats*, ed. by M. B. Forman (New York, 1935). Subsequent references assume this edition.

² See Sidney Colvin, *John Keats* (New York, 1917), pp. 379-80.

³ Matthew Arnold saw a direct relation between Haydon's story and Keats's exclamation, however. See his *Essays in Criticism*, Second Series (London, 1898), pp. 100-101.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100, p. 115.

⁵ *John Keats: A Literary Biography* (Boston, 1908), p. 62.

⁶ Colvin, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

⁷ *The Poems of John Keats*, 6th ed. (London, 1935), p. xxxviii.

⁸ *The Mind of John Keats* (New York, 1926), p. 12. Thorpe does not actually offer a definition of his own, but he quotes Hancock, Colvin, and De Sélincourt approvingly.

"instinctive impulses" and "intuitions" (J M Murry)⁹ "intuitions" as opposed to "concepts" (Lascelles Abercrombie),¹⁰ "individual, isolated intuitions" (C L Finney),¹¹ and so on. The most recent book on Keats (Weiner Beyer, *Keats and the Daemon King*, New York, 1947) strongly reaffirms these definitions, and exalts Keats's "intuitions" to the empyrean.

[Keats's] yearning 'O for a life of Sensations rather than [of] Thoughts' has nothing whatever to do with the sensory delight of popular misconception. Rather, it is the life of transcendental visions, or super rational intuitions, of divine love, beauty, and truth.¹²

Despite "swiche pleyn accord" of critical judgment, it is hard to believe that Keats would have written "sensations" if what he meant was "intuitions." To be sure, the immediate context of the ejaculation includes a distinction (far from lucid) between "the truth of imagination" and the truth of "consecutive reasoning." But any other support for the gloss of "intuitions" can scarcely be found, whereas some rather impressive, even definitive, evidence exists on the other side.

This evidence is not to be found in Letter 31. Important as this letter is, it presents too many difficulties and ramifications to explore adequately in this space,¹³ and it is therefore fortunate that the evidence called for can be presented from other sources and at less length.¹⁴

If the glossing of "sensations" as "intuitions" faithfully represents Keats's meaning, it seems reasonable to assume that he may have used the word in a similar sense on other occasions, especially when discussing matters aesthetic.¹⁵ Yet no one, so far as I am

⁹ *Keats and Shakespeare* (London, 1925), p. 29.

¹⁰ "The Second Version of *Hyperion*," *The John Keats Memorial Volume* (London, 1921), p. 27.

¹¹ *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry*, I, 243.

¹² P. 125, repeated on p. 143. The second "of" is omitted in Beyer's quotation.

¹³ "What the imagination seizes as beauty must be truth" is but one of several enigmatic and obscure statements in the letter.

¹⁴ Elsewhere I have given detailed scrutiny to this letter (in a forthcoming book, *Keats's Prefigurative Imagination: A Study of the Identification of "Beauty" and "Truth" in his Writings*).

¹⁵ His peculiar use of the word "abstract" (= concrete, imaginative), for example, is frequently recurrent, and indicates a habit of usage. This has been recognized by Thorpe, *op cit*, pp. 35-36, and Finney, *op cit*, II, 454.

aware, has ever sought to find out how he used the word on other occasions. Being curious, I have made a list of all occurrences of the word in Keats's writings (the Concordance gives but one instance in the poetry). To reduce space I omit all but the immediate context, assuming that the full context is readily accessible to all.

- 1 What time you were before the music [piano] sitting,
And the rich notes to each *sensation* fitting¹⁶
- 2 I now hear the voice [of the sea] most audibly while pleasing
myself in the idea of your *sensations* (42)¹⁷
- 3 I wish I had a heart always open to such *sensations* [his sensi-
bility of a friend's kindness] (55)
- 4 O for a recourse somewhat human independent of the great consolations of religion and undepraved *sensations*—of the beautiful—the poetical in all things (60)
- 5 O for a life of *sensations* rather than of thoughts'
- 6 The difference of high *sensations* with and without knowledge (140)
- 7 What a thing would be a history of her life and *sensations* (174)
- 8 The genius of poetry cannot be matured by law and precept, but by *sensation* and watchfulness (223)
- 9 I like her because one has no *sensations*—what we both are is taken for granted (233)
- 10 No *sensation* is created by greatness but by the number of orders a man has at his button holes (234)
- 11 he could not rid himself of the *sensation* even in the dark hold of the ship (248)
- 12 With what *sensation* do you read Fielding? (258)
- 13 I went the other day into an ironmonger's shop—without any change in my *sensations* (285)
- 14 My passions are all asleep from my having slumbered till nearly eleven and weakened the animal fiber all over me to a delightful *sensation* about three degrees on this side of faintness (315)
- 15 In those two miles he [Coleridge] broached a thousand things nightingales, poetry—on poetical *sensation*—metaphysics—different genera and species of dreams (324)
- 16 For instance suppose a rose to have *sensation* (335)
- 17 as a relief to myself from a too lax *sensation* of life (372)
- 18 I have indeed scarcely anything else to say, leading so monotonous a life, except I was to give you a history of *sensations*, and day-nightmares (374)
- 19 to be able to bear unhurt the shock of extreme thought and *sensation* (*Ibid*)

¹⁶ *Epistle to Charles Cowden Clarke*, l 114

¹⁷ Figures in parentheses give the page references in M. B. Forman's edition of the letters

- 20 Miltonic verse can not be written but in an artful or rather artist's humour I wish to give myself up to other *sensations* (384)
- 21 I had another strange *sensation* there was not one house I felt any pleasure to call at (400)
- 22 [*Lamia*] must take hold of people in some way—give either pleasant or unpleasant *sensation* What they want is a *sensation* of some sort (402)
- 24 I think it [*The Eve of St Mark*] will give you the *sensation* of walking about an old country town in a coolish evening (414)
- 25 Miltonic verse cannot be written but in the vein of art—I wish to devote myself to another *sensation*— (425)
- 26 I have a *sensation* at the present moment as though I was dissolving (436)
- 27 Either that gloom overspread me or I was suffering under some passionate feeling, or if I turn'd to versify that acerbated the poison of either *sensation* (465)
- 28 I shall endeavour to go though it be with the *sensation* of marching up against a battery (508)
- 29 I would go to — and make some inquiries after you, if I could with any bearable *sensation* (514)
- 30 I should have delighted in setting off for London for the *sensation* merely (520)
- 31 the difference of my *sensations* with respect to Miss Brawne and my sister is amazing (*Ibid*)
- 32 those depraved *sensations* which the want of any education excites in many (521, note—a conversation of Keats with Severn, as reported by the latter to Lord Houghton)

Study of the contexts of these thirty-two instances of the word "sensations" in Keats's writings leads to the following inferences (1) With the possible exception of "poetical sensation" (one of the topics of Coleridge's ambulatory monologue), Keats's habits of usage appear to be consistent, there are variations in nuance, but not in the central meaning (2) In general the meaning seems to be something like this the characteristic feelings or emotions arising in some particular circumstance (whether in actual life or in aesthetic experience, and whether pleasing or unpleasing) Reference to the *NED* shows that this meaning was normal in Keats's time, as it is today (3) Unless Keats was departing radically from his habitual usage in Letter 31, the meaning seems to be approximately the same there (the reference being specifically to aesthetic, and of course pleasurable, sensations). (4) Of the thirty-two instances of the word, there is not a single demonstrable reference to "intuitional" processes or apprehensions

It might still be contended, of course, on grounds however

dubious, that "O for a life of sensations" is a kind of "solemn fenix of Arabye" In anticipation of such a rejoinder, it may be well to offer additional evidence If we desire examples of Keats's predilection for aesthetic "sensations," we have not far to seek, *Endymion*, *Isabella*, *Lamia*, *The Eve of St Agnes*, the Francesca sonnet, the "Bright star" sonnet, "I stood tip-toe . ." (which Keats described as "a posey of luxuries"—27-28), and several other poems are clearly compounded of "sensations" rather than of "thoughts"

To be enamoured of "sensations" is in fact a normal sign of mental growth, as Keats explained in his celebrated "simile of human life" life is, he wrote, like a "mansion of many apartments," the first of which is "the infant or *thoughtless* chamber, in which we remain as long as we do not think", the second chamber is that of "maiden-thought," wherein "we see *nothing but pleasant wonders*"¹⁸ While we luxuriate amid the "pleasant wonders," the "thinking principle" gradually awakens within us, but prior to this awakening, as Keats says, "we do not think" His words should not be taken too literally, of course, but it is hardly possible to contend that the "pleasant wonders" (= "sensations"?) which he found so enchanting were actually "intuitions" in disguise¹⁹

There is still more probative evidence, however A revealing statement on aesthetic "sensations" occurs in a letter addressed to the same correspondent (Benjamin Bailey) as Letter 31, and preceding Letter 31 by less than three weeks

O for a recourse somewhat human independent of the great consolations of religion and *undepraved sensations*—of the beautiful—the poetical in all things—O for a remedy against such wrongs within the pale of the world!²⁰

¹⁸ P 143 The italics are mine

¹⁹ To what extent Keats's thought in Letter 31 and Letter 64 (the "simile of human life") may have been tinged with the so called "sensational" or "associationist" psychology of the day, it would not be easy to determine For example, there appears to be some resemblance between his "life of sensations," and "the language of the sense" and the "sensations sweet" which Wordsworth praised so fervently in *Tintern Abbey* (108, 27) And Keats's "simile of human life" reminds one of the first (or perhaps the first two) of "the three ages of man" described in Wordsworth's poem But there is no evidence that the younger poet conceived of mental development in the schematic and orthodox manner of the associationists See, nevertheless, J R Caldwell, *John Keats' Fancy* (Ithaca, 1945), especially Chap II, and Arthur Beatty, *William Wordsworth His Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations*, rev ed (Madison, 1927)

²⁰ P 60

It the syntax is a bit confusing here, it is because Keats adds two appositives to his second "consolation" that is, "undepraved sensations" = [the enjoyment of] "the beautiful" = [the enjoyment of] "the poetical in all things" In other words Keats is searching for a humanistic justification of suffering not dependent on either religion or aesthetic enjoyment Judging by the adjective "undepraved" which qualifies "sensations," Keats evidently felt it needful to persuade his firm-minded, theological correspondent that the enjoyment of beauty (especially in poetry) was not an immoral self-indulgence When however in his very next letter to Bailey (Letter 31), Keats sought to champion, this time more ardently, "a life of sensations rather than of thoughts," he had no need to repeat the defensive adjective "undepraved," because (1) his correspondent could be trusted to connect the two passages on aesthetic "sensations," and (2) Keats was now so confident of the value of the "life of sensations" that he was no longer on the defensive

Let us suppose, once more, that what he actually meant was not "sensations" but "intuitions" Since in both letters to Bailey "sensations" appears to have the same referent, the adjective "undepraved" ought to fit as well into one letter as the other But to call "intuitions" "undepraved" would be, obviously, both redundant and motiveless And if "undepraved" is incompatible with "intuitions," it is doubly incompatible with the gloss proposed in 1947, viz "transcendental visions, or super-rational intuitions, of divine love, beauty, and truth"

To clinch the point even further, we can turn to a context which defines "depraved sensations" These are exploited, according to Keats, by Byron in his mocking account of the shipwreck in *Don Juan* "Byron's perverted education makes him assume to feel, and try to impart to others, those *depraved sensations* which the want of any education inspires in many"²⁰ Thus "depraved sensations" are not proper aesthetic sensations, in Keats's estimate, but "perverted," non-genuine, perhaps even immoral. "Undepraved sensations," on the other hand, are the very substance—and precious reward—of the aesthetic life

NEWELL F FORD

Stanford University

²¹ See M B Forman, *op cit*, note to Letter 238, p 521

SHAKESPEARE'S WORD-PLAY ON *TOMBE*

Tombe as it occurs in Shakespeare's Sonnet 83 appears to be a deliberate pun and as such provides a climax for a small history of some associations attached to the word in Shakespeare's usage

Both in Sonnets and in plays Shakespeare exhibited an interest in the peculiar relationships of meaning set up by juxtaposing *tomb*¹ and two of the very small group of words with which he rimes it. Twice in the Sonnets² and at least twice in the plays³ the rime of *tomb* with *womb* assists in suggesting the obvious but provocative contrast between the receptacle from which man comes into this world and that to which he goes⁴. Twice in the Sonnets⁵ and at least once in the plays⁶ the rime of *tomb* with *dumb* reinforces the suggestion of the permanent silence that normally characterizes the ponderous and marble jaws of the final receptacle.

These overtones of *tomb* are as obvious today, perhaps, as when they were written. But a shift in vowel pronunciation has so nearly obliterated the evidence of another set of associations, originally too obvious for comment, that it has recently been overlooked. One kind of Shakespearean pun is the consequence of Shakespeare's interest in the relationships of meaning set up by juxtaposing two words which, having roughly the same sound, can be pronounced as one. The word with which Shakespeare punned *tomb* was that which we spell *tome*, meaning a book, often a large, heavy, formidable book.

¹ I do not wish to make too much of a point on the matter of spelling, but it seems convenient to employ *tombe* only when there is some question of equivocation in the word.

² 3 7 and 86 4

³ *H6A* IV v 34 and *R & J* II iii 9

⁴ Shakespeare was by no means the first to perceive and make use of this phonetic accident. The rime occurs, for instance, in the popular and pathetic elegy which Chidiock Tichborne was supposed to have "Written with His Own Hand in the Tower Before his Execution."

I sought my death and found it in my womb,
I looked for life and saw it was a shade,
I trod the earth and knew it was my tomb

⁵ 83 12 and 101 11

⁶ *All's Well* II iii 147, see also *M. A. d. o.* v iii 9

For eye-reading, the pun presents no difficulty when we bear in mind that both *tomb* and *tome* could be spelled *tombe* in the seventeenth century, *tombe* is, actually, the only spelling in the Quarto edition of the Sonnets for the word which modern editors spell *tomb*.

Furthermore, the history of spelling outside the Sonnets confirms the probability that *tomb* and *tome* were readily capable of that type of mental interchange upon which puns thrive. The intrusion of the *b* in seventeenth-century spellings of the word meaning *book* can most readily be accounted for on the grounds that *tome* was subjected to the phonetic and orthographic influence of such words as *lamb*, *limb*, *womb*, and *tomb*, especially the last of these. The confusion operated also, however, in the other direction. Davies⁷ records a sixteenth-century spelling *tome* for the word meaning *sepulchre*. We are led to the not surprising conclusion that it has been from time to time quite possible to achieve ambiguity in the written form of either word. That such ambiguity did actually produce a misunderstanding may be illustrated by an accident that occurred to a poem of John Donne's. The third stanza of his "Valediction Of the Book" runs thus:

This book as long lived as the elements
 Or as the world's form, this all graved tome
 In cypher writ or new made idiom
 (We for Love's clergy only're instruments)
 When this book is made thus,
 Should again the ravenous
 Vandals and Goths inundate us,
 Learning were safe, in this our universe
 Schools might learn sciences, spheres music, angels verse

In the 1669 edition *tome* appeared *tomb*, but was corrected in subsequent editions. Whether Donne was turning to his own uses the pun of Shakespeare is beside our point at the moment,⁸ what is of moment to us is that such confusions in spelling not only confirm the mental interchangeability which is one element of a pun but also point to a phonetic similarity.

⁷ *English Pronunciation from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, p. 86.

⁸ Two further passages in Donne offer the teasing possibility that this poet was also toying with the ambiguous overtone suggestions in *tomb*. These are the fourth stanza of "The Canonization" and the third stanza of "To the Countess of Bedford."

That strong phonetic similarity between the words did exist is a conclusion which the other available evidence supports. Since we have ample evidence and sufficient authorities⁹ to establish the probability that in Shakespeare's time *tomb* was pronounced much as it is today, [tūm], it becomes pertinent to inquire what was probably Shakespeare's pronunciation of *tome*. Since Shakespeare does not use it outside the passages we are concerned with and since there appears to be no direct testimony to any sixteenth or seventeenth century pronunciation of this word, and since it was introduced from French into English too late to fall into any of the patterns of sound-change out of Middle English, we must draw inferences from the words with which it may be logically linked.

In the first place, as we have noticed, it appears to have become linked in spelling and hence probably in pronunciation with a riming set of common words such as *womb* and *tomb*. If this was so, we must account for its modern pronunciation on the not unlikely ground that, being a relatively bookish word, it came readily within the hegemony of eighteenth-century classical scholars who were happy to restore it to "correctness."

A somewhat similar phonetic history can actually be traced in the word *Rome*. In Elizabethan England *Rome*, following the prevailing phonetic trend, was generally pronounced like Modern English *room*. So it was in Shakespeare¹⁰ and so it was when Spenser rimed it with our word *tomb*¹¹. Wyld offers a reason for the triumph of the modern pronunciation: "The present pronunciation of *Rome*, instead of the historically normal [rūm], is comparatively recent and is due to the influence of the French or Italian pronunciation, perhaps also to the spelling"¹².

There is one further piece of evidence pointing to [tūm] as a probable Shakespearean pronunciation of *tome*. In 1617 one Robert

⁹ See, for instance, the following

Ellis, A. J., "Shakespeare's Puns," in *Early English Pronunciation*, Part III, Chap. VIII, p. 102, p. 925

Zachrisson, R. E., *The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time*, p. 197

Wyld, H. C., *A History of Modern Colloquial English*, p. 234

¹⁰ *KJ* III 1 180, *JO* I 11 156, *RL* 715 and 1644

¹¹ "Ruins of Rome," v 7. It is to be observed that Shakespeare once appears to recognize the pronunciation which subsequently prevailed, in *H6C* III 1 51 he hangs a pun between *Rome* and *room*

¹² *Op cit*, p. 239

Robinson, a Londoner, published a small treatise called *The Art of Pronunciation*, containing a phonetic alphabet and a Latin poem transcribed in the alphabet. This treatise was examined with care by Professor H. G. Fiedler in the Annual Bulletin of the Modern Humanities Research Association in November, 1936. "Robinson," as Professor Fiedler says, "transcribes as *ū* every Latin stressed long *ō*." If we can accept Robinson as a reliable recorder of vowel sounds, we can approach the word *tome* from two directions: (1) if the vowel had been attracted into conformity with native English words which had originally been pronounced [ō], the pronunciation was [tūm], (2) if the vowel was given a pronunciation like that of Latin words with long *ō*, the pronunciation was [tūm]. *Tome* apparently had come into English from French at the beginning of the sixteenth century, so that there is a gap in our syllogism. But the weight of such evidence as we have makes it most likely that [tūm] was the usual pronunciation of the word *tome* at the time the sonnets were composed.

Granted that the external evidence is permissive rather than conclusive, let it be supposed that to Shakespeare's ear *tome* and *tomb* were sounded enough alike for purposes of a pun.

If the pun between *tome* and *tomb* was to be witty and effective, the flavor of *tome* had to be approximately what it is today. This was the case. By 1573 the word had come to signify the whole of a book, frequently a large volume. *NED* records a title with that date: "The whole works of . Tyndal, Frith, and Barnes . collected and compiled in one Tome together." By 1621 the ponderous tome was also formidable, forbidding, perhaps seldom opened. Burton in the *Anatomy of Melancholy* was asking, "To what end are such great tomes?" Shakespeare's Sonnets were composed somewhere between these two dates.

The form *tombe* occurs five times in the Sonnets (in 3, 17, 83, 86, and 101), and *tombs* occurs once (in 107). Assuming that these particular sonnets were written chronologically in this order, it appears that Shakespeare first used the word simply to designate a sepulchre, that when he next used it he probably perceived a pun whose secondary meaning was *tome*, and that when he used it a third time he planned the pun with all its deliberate, subtle venom. In the next two instances thereafter, he so used the word that the punning associations are interesting if brought to mind—

but they are not insisted upon. In the final instance he undertook to eliminate equivocation from the word, to restore it to singleness of meaning.

Let us examine the series, disregarding Sonnet 3, which does not pun on our word. The heavy-footed exposition we shall use will be at least as offensive as such treatments of wit necessarily are. No apology, however, is made for pointing out that in all five of the sonnets we are concerned with, the subject matter in hand was the future fame conferrable by writings in praise of a man. This is an area of interest in which talk of books may reasonably be expected.

The first quatrain of Sonnet 17 runs thus

Who will believe my verse in time to come,
If it were fill'd with your most high deserts?
Though yet, heaven knows, it is but as a tombe
Which hides your life and shows not half your parts

Here we may unhesitatingly agree with all the editors in recognizing that Shakespeare likened the poetry in question to a tomb. Still there is noticeable at first blush some slight awkwardness in the image of a tomb which hides life, tombs are designed to hide death. Doubtless Shakespeare had in mind the writing on a tomb, an epitaph could very appropriately be blamed if it hid the dead man's life and showed too few of his accomplishments. But if a tomb is considered as a piece of writing then its essential function is the same as that of a tome. Shakespeare apparently recognized and may possibly even have planned this implication of his use of the word.

The poet who speaks in Sonnets 82 and 83 comments upon the other writers who dedicate their works to his own particular patron and implies that by "blessing every book" the patron encourages the writers in this practice. In Sonnet 83 he asserts that he has himself avoided the portraiture of praise, knowing that praise is incapable of matching the original. The last quatrain runs thus

This silence for my sin you did impute,
Which shall be most my glory, being dumb,
For I impair not beauty being mute,
When others would give life and bring a tombe

The unkind pun in the last line is here too pointed to be accidental. It asserts (but not unequivocally) that the rival who brings his book confers oblivion instead of the intended immortality. This

barb, which might well have been envied by Dryden and Pope, is part of a complex and beautifully conceived design. The design calls into play echoes well outside the limits of the individual sonnet, yet even in the sentence which it caps there is a most adroit interplay of images and ideas. The *tome* impairs beauty as a tomb impairs beauty, the tomb is mute in a sense in which Shakespeare is not mute, and the *tome* is loquacious where Shakespeare holds his peace. Hence the *tome* is loquacious but uncommunicative, and death-dealing instead of immortalizing.

The first quatrain of Sonnet 86 is familiar indeed

Was it the proud full sail of his great verse,
Bound for the prize of all too precious you,
That did my ripe thoughts in my brain inhearse,
Making their tombe the womb wherein they grew?

Here we have so clear and conventional an image of still-born thoughts that the suggestion that the appropriate housing of ripe thoughts is not then author's brain but a book is neither insisted upon nor necessary to good sense. Yet recognition that *tombe* incidentally spelled *book* by no means hurts the effectiveness of the quatrain. On the contrary such recognition gives a new twist to the well-worn womb—tomb irony.

In Sonnet 101 Shakespeare's poet rebukes his muse for neglecting his "love." The muse is made to bring up the customary excuse that truth needs no painting. The poet makes his rejoinder

Because he needs no praise, wilt thou be dumb?
Excuse not silence so, for 't lies in thee
To make him much outlive a gilded tombe
And to be praised of ages yet to be

Here again the sense is comfortably full without the play on *tome*. That "gilded *tomb*" is the primary meaning is clear from its parallel in Sonnet 55

Not marble, nor the gilded monuments
Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme

Yet if when Sonnet 101 was written, *tombe* had been, as we suppose, already twice or thrice used equivocally within memory, it is hard to believe that Shakespeare was innocent of *double entendre* now. "Gilded *tome*" would make excellent sense in this context, signifying a book whose special merit was decorative embellish-

ment The poet, then, may be supposed to assure his muse that it was in the power of her unembellished song to make the patron outlive such a prettified volume If he did indeed incidentally sneer at a rival's gilded tome Shakespeare had prepared his way by mention of books and by repeated mention of painting and color as symbols of verbal flattery¹³ as well as by his pointed puns on *tombe*

Finally, the last four lines in Sonnet 107

I'll live in this poor rhyme,
While he [death] insults o'er dull and speechless tribes
And thou in this shalt find thy monument,
When tyrants' crests and tombes of brass are spent

The word *this* in line 13 repeats "this poor rhyme" and is set in contrast with "tyrants' crests and tombs of brass" Since *tombe* has been quibbled over repeatedly, the quibble is apt to recur with every recurrence of the word unless specifically disclaimed In the last line of Sonnet 107 the *tombs* are emphatically not books, and the phrase "of brass" serves as a disclaimer¹⁴

T WALTER HERBERT

University of Florida

MELVILLE'S THIRD WHALER

Herman Melville's last whaling cruise, from Eimeo in the Society Islands to Lahaina on the Island of Maui, Sandwich Island Group, was in the *Charles and Henry*, a Nantucket ship, of 336 tons burthen, belonging to Charles G and Henry Coffin The ship, under the command of Captain John B Coleman, came to anchor in the roadstead of Lahaina on April 27, 1843

On a date between that of the arrival of the *Charles and Henry* and May 10 when she sailed, probably on May 3, Captain Coleman appeared before John Stetson, United States Vice Commercial Agent at Lahaina, and discharged Herman Melville, John Wallace, and Joseph Whiting Wallace was a sick man, and a sum of money

¹³ See for instance Sonnets 82 and 83, referred to above

¹⁴ Of course that disclaimer, with a right inflection of the voice, might well reach back to line 13 and make "this" signify "this tome," "this book of sonnets" as well as "this rhyme."

was deposited on his account as a "destitute seaman," but Melville and Whiting were evidently regularly discharged by consent of themselves and Captain Coleman

Melville stayed at Lahaina until May 18 or shortly thereafter, when he and nineteen other whaling men, seventeen of whom were destitute seamen, were transported to Oahu, probably in the schooner *Star*, under the command of a Captain Buirroughs

These significant facts in Melville's whaling career, now brought to light for the first time, are documented by letters in a loose folder, "Miscellaneous Letters, 1838-1843," and by other papers of the Honolulu Post Records Collection, General Records, Executive and Foreign Affairs Branch, of the National Archives¹

The most important document of this group for the Melville student is a letter, dated May 18, 1843, from John Stetson, United States Vice Commercial Agent at Lahaina, to William Hooper, Vice Commercial Agent at Oahu, which contains the following information

I send by this vessel [evidently the schooner *Star*, Captain Buirroughs]²

John Wallace, dischd from Ship Charles & Henry [and sixteen other destitute seamen] Also 3 men that were discharged at this Office, not however on my hands,—their names are Herman Mellvil [*sic*], Joseph Whiting, dischd from Ship Chs & Henry & Francis Sarsfield, dischd from Barque Damon[]

It is, indeed, fortunate that this the official letter, bearing seal and outside address, has survived. For there is another version of this letter, in the same handwriting, which is misleading in the extreme³ This version, surviving in a ledger, which is clearly either a careless first draft of the official letter or a hastily written, erroneous office copy, contains a significant difference in wording

" Herman Mellvil, Jos Whiting & Francis Sarsfield dis[charged] from Barque Damon "

It is impossible to substantiate Melville's connection with the ship *Charles and Henry* by checking the Captain's crew list of the 1840-1845 voyage or the consular certificates appended thereto, for

¹ I should like to thank Mrs Natalia Summers and Miss Julia Bland for considerable assistance in the discovery of these materials

² Hooper had written Stetson on May 8, 1843, that he had "requested Capt Burroughs of the Sch^r *Star* to receive on board any seaman which may be on your hands "

³ In "Lahaina, Records, Protests, Letters, etc., 1842-1855, No 7625."

almost all Nantucket custom house records have been destroyed ⁴ It can be proved, however, that Herman Melville and Joseph Whiting did not serve in the barque *Damon* of Newport, Rhode Island, and were not discharged from that vessel at Lahaina.

Complete custom house records of the 1842-1846 voyage of the *Damon*, under the command of Captain Oliver Potter, are extant. They contain no mention of Herman Melville or Joseph Whiting. The name of Francis Sarsfield, however, is recorded on the official crew list carried on the voyage, and it appears on the only certificate of discharge issued by John Stetson to Captain Potter in May, 1843 ⁵

If Melville could not have served in the barque *Damon*, what is the case for his connection with the *Charles and Henry* besides the mention of his name in Stetson's official letter of May 18, 1843? Apparently it is a good one. For one thing, the *Charles and Henry* visited the Society Islands at a time when Melville is known to have been there ⁶ She was reported at Tahiti on November 7, 1842,⁷ and at Eimeo during the same month ⁸ Captain Coleman, upon his

⁴ According to Edouard A. Stackpole, President of the Nantucket Historical Society, in conversation with the writer, the Nantucket Custom House was closed during Woodrow Wilson's first administration, and all records were transferred to the Boston Custom House where they were stored in the basement. Later they were damaged by water, and most of them sold as waste paper. Many ships registers from Nantucket, however, have survived and are now in the National Archives.

⁵ I am obliged to Walter Dring, Jr., Deputy Collector of Customs, Newport, Rhode Island, for photostatic copies of relevant custom house and consular papers of the *Damon*, including a certificate signed by John Stetson at Lahaina on May 25, 1843, which discharged only one seaman from the *Damon*—Francis Sarsfield. This was the only certificate issued to Captain Potter in May, 1843. ("Consular Statement of Fees, Lahaina," in Consular Letters, Honolulu, Volume 1.)

Since the *Damon* was not cleared for sailing until October 18, 1842 (Newport *Mercury* of October 22, 1842), and gave as her most recent port of call before reaching Lahaina that of Callao (Consular Letters, Honolulu, Volume 1) where she anchored March 17, 1843 (Ship's Daily Journal, Callao, in National Archives), it seems unlikely that she touched at the Society Islands at all.

⁶ See Charles R. Anderson, *Melville in the South Seas* (New York, 1939), pp. 284-323, and Ida Leeson, "The Mutiny on the *Lucy Ann*," *PQ*, xix (October, 1940), 370-379.

⁷ Nantucket *Inquirer* of May 6, 1843.

⁸ "John Howland reported Chas. and Henry at Eimeo [*sic*] with 350 bbls.,

arrival at Lahaina, gave "Emeo" [sic] as the place last touched at by the *Charles and Henry*⁹

Furthermore, Joseph Whiting was at Eimeo shortly before the time of arrival of the *Charles and Henry*, having deserted from the Nantucket ship *John Adams* on October 16, 1842,¹⁰ and he could have joined the crew of the *Charles and Henry* at approximately the same time that Melville did

Finally, the facts of the voyage of the *Charles and Henry* correspond to those attributed to the "Leviathan" in *Omoo*,¹¹ Melville's most nearly autobiographical novel¹² The actual whaler, like her fictional counterpart, was a "luckless ship in the fishery"¹³ When the *Charles and Henry* arrived at Eimeo, she had taken only 350 barrels of sperm oil during a twenty-three months' voyage,¹⁴ no more than the *Acushnet* had stowed down during the first six months of her maiden voyage¹⁵

That Melville might well have shouted, "So, hurrah for the coast of Japan!"¹⁶ upon joining the crew of the *Charles and Henry* is attested by the fact that although the ship did not head immediately for that whaling ground, it was her destination after recruiting at Lahaina in late April and early May of 1843¹⁷ But for his leaving the vessel at Lahaina, stove boats off the coast of Japan might have been for Herman Melville an actual rather than a vicarious experience

23 mos out" (Nantucket *Inquirer* of May 13, 1843) The *Charles and Henry* had sailed on December 20, 1840 (Alexander Starbuck, *History of the American Whale Fishery from Its Earliest Inception to the Year 1876*, [Waltham, Mass., 1878] pp. 366-367)

⁹ "Consular Returns, Lahaina," in Consular Letters, Department of State, Honolulu, Volume I, in National Archives

¹⁰ Consular Papers, Tahiti, in National Archives

¹¹ I should like to thank Jay Leyda, who first suggested the possibility that the *Charles and Henry* might have been Melville's third whaler, for considerable assistance

¹² After an exhaustive study of *Omoo*, Anderson, *op cit*, p. 199, came to this conclusion

¹³ *Omoo*, p. 371 (Constable and Company, London, 1922.)

¹⁴ Nantucket *Inquirer* of May 13, 1843

¹⁵ The *Acushnet* was spoken on July 4, 1841, by the ship *William Wirt* of Fairhaven and reported a take of 350 barrels of sperm oil (Logbook of *William Wirt* in Baker Library, Harvard University)

¹⁶ *Omoo*, p. 371

¹⁷ Nantucket *Inquirer* of October 2, 1843

The *Charles and Henry* came to anchor at Lahaina on April 27, 1843, with 500 barrels of sperm oil aboard¹⁸ John Wallace, a sick member of the crew, was discharged on May 3,¹⁹ and since only one certificate was issued to Captain Coleman during this recruiting period,²⁰ it is reasonable to assume that it was an inclusive one and contained the names of Joseph Whiting and Herman Melville²¹

WILSON L. HEFLIN

United States Naval Academy

THE TROUBADOURS AND THE ASSASSINS

The Old Man of the Mountain and his Assassins appear as ornaments in at least five Provençal poems. Evidently, this colorful, already half-legendary cult had made a considerable impression on the troubadours. Evidently, also, their public could understand the allusions without explanation, for none is given. The uses these poets made of the romantic Sheikh-el-Jebel and his followers¹ practically exhaust the possibilities of connecting them with love and lovers.

One of the most explicit comparisons is in the poem *Pos descobrir ni retraire* of Aimeric de Peguilhan. The author says to his Lady: "You have me more fully in your power than the Old Man his Assassins, who go to kill his mortal enemies, even if they were beyond France."

Car mieills m'avetz ses doptanssa,
Qe l Vieills l'Asasina gen,

¹⁸ "Consular Returns, Lahaina, January 1—July 1, 1843," in Consular Letters, Department of State, Honolulu, Volume I. The *Charles and Henry* evidently reached the roadstead of Lahaina on April 26, 1843 (See Nantucket *Inquirer* of October 2, 1843.)

¹⁹ "Statement of Cases of Relief Afforded to destitute American seaman . . . , Lahaina," in Consular Letters, Department of State, Honolulu, Volume I.

²⁰ "Consular Statement of Fees Received at Lahaina . . . ," in Consular Letters, Department of State, Honolulu, Volume I.

²¹ The background and facts of the 1840-1845 voyage of the *Charles and Henry* are subjects of a more extended study by the present writer.

¹ For a recent account of them, and numerous references, see Charles E. Nowell, "The Old Man of the Mountain," in *Speculum*, xxii, 497-519.

Qu il vant, neis s'eron part Franssa,
 Tant li son obedien,
 Aucir sos gerriers mortals²

The Lady here is the Old Man, the poet is the Assassin, who will do whatever his Lady commands. This blind obedience with complete disregard for consequences was a distinguishing characteristic of the sect.

Making a very similar application of the theme, Bernart de Bondeilh declares "Just as the Assassins serve their master unflinchingly, so I have served Love with unswerving loyalty."

Tot aissi m pren con fai als assesis,
 Qe fan tot so qe lurs senhors lur dī,
 Qe no n pensan failhir ser nī mati,
 Tant lo crezon e tant ll es chascus fis,
 E le senhors, qar conois certamen
 Qe chascus fai de grat son mandamen,
 Fa ls comensar tal re, segon q'aug dir,
 Don prendon moit, ans q'o puecan complir

Tot cissamen hai ieu estat aclis
 E fins e francs vas amor, so us afi³

Here Love, not the Lady, is the Old Man whom the poet serves as an Assassin. It should be noted also that there is no specific reference to murder, the Old Man's assignments might be difficult tasks of many kinds.

With the same unspecialized conception of the Assassin's duties, an anonymous poet says to his Lady in the love letter or *domnejaire*

² Poem 10, 42 according to the numbering of Pillet-Carstens, *Bibliographie der Troubadours*, Halle, 1933, p. 14. These are lines 28-32. Neither this nor the other poem of Aimeric which we shall have occasion to cite has appeared in a critical edition, though Mr. W. P. Shepard and I have been working for some time on a complete edition of Aimeric. The text given here for both poems is that of A (Pillet-Carstens, p. x), as it appears in the diplomatic edition of Fakscher and De Lollis, in *Studi di filologia romanza*, III, nos. 391 and 397 respectively. It would probably be preferable here to read *s'era* for *s'eron* in line 30, although the majority of the MSS have the plural form, in any case, the basic idea of the comparison is not affected.

³ Pillet-Carstens, 59, 1, edited by Appel in *Provenzalische Inedita aus Pariser Handschriften*, Leipzig, 1892 (Altfranzösische Bibliothek, XVIII), pp. 22-24.

beginning *Bona dompna, pros ez onrada* ⁴ "I am your Assassin, who hopes to win Paradise through doing your commands"

Lo vostre verais ancessis,
Que cre conquistar paradis
Per far toz vestres mandamens

Here we have an implied explanation of the unfailing obedience of the Assassins to the Old Man of the Mountain their belief that this obedience guaranteed their entry into Heaven. Such a motivation the contemporaries of the crusades and the *chansons de geste* could easily understand.

Of the three examples cited so far, two make no mention at all of murder as a function of the Assassins. The third (that from Aimeric de Peguilhan) does indeed give murder as their chief duty, but the detailed allusion makes it very clear that the word "Assassin" was not for Aimeric a common noun meaning "murderer." It could hardly have been only that for an audience of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, when the Old Man was still powerful (there were, of course, several "Old Men"), and his followers were well known and greatly feared. The word inevitably had a very specific reference to this sect, and its application to any other killer constituted a recognizable figure of speech. Later, to be sure, the transition to a generic term was made in several languages, and a verb coined, and so on, but only later, and as a result of this early figurative use. I insist on this point here because in the two examples that remain to be cited the reader, if unforeshadowed, might make the mistake of assuming that the word was as colorless then as it is now.

The first example is another from Aimeric de Peguilhan. We have already seen him compare himself to an Assassin and his Lady to the Old Man of the Mountain. Here, he likens his heart to an Assassin, since it kills him for his Lady's sake.

Mas faich avetz ansessi
Mon cor que per vos m'auci ⁵

Knowing as we do that the poet must have had the sect in mind

⁴ Edited by Suchier in *Denkmal der provenzalischen Literatur und Sprache*, Halle, 1883, I, 311 ff., lines 9-11.

⁵ Pillet-Carstens, no. 10, 24 (*Essamen cum l'azimans*), these are lines 13-14. For the text followed, see note 2.

when he wrote these lines, we are justified in taking *per vos* to mean that here also the Lady is the Old Man of the Mountain, who sends the Assassin

And, finally, we have this from Giraut de Bornelh "My Lady's love (i e, my love for her) is an Assassin, which kills me"

Ren als no lh sai comtar
Mas que s'amors m'auç
Aí, plus mal assesí
Noca m saup envirar *

The editor, Kolsen, translates *assesí* "Morder", but I have already expressed my doubt that the word could have become so colorless in Giraut's day. We must, I think, interpret the lines to mean that the Lady is the Old Man, and love is the Assassin whom she sends against the poet. Kolsen "Ach, einen schlimmeren Morder konnte ich mir gar nicht ausersehen." This seems to miss the point completely, my own feeling is that we should read *envirar* (the reading of nearly all the MSS) for *envirar*, and in any case understand the subject of *saup* to be "she," not "I." For, taking this as a reference to the Old Man and his Assassins (and I think we must take it so), I find it unlikely that the poet would call himself the Old Man who "selects" or "sends" an Assassin (love) against himself.

In citing these examples, I have not tried to follow a chronological order, because it seemed advisable to put the most convincing ones first, and also because the dates of the poems cannot be fixed with any certainty. It would be desirable, however, to date them as accurately as we can. Here are the known facts. Aimeric de Peguilhan seems to have written between 1195 and 1230,⁷ Giraut de Bornelh between 1165 and 1200.⁸ Kolsen⁹ dates the poem we quote "vielleicht 1169." Bernart de Bondeilh's has not been dated, though in this, his one preserved poem, he refers to a Marquis of Carret, who is probably, as the editor identifies him, Otto del

* Kolsen, *Samtliche Lieder des Troubadours Giraut de Bornelh*, Halle, 1910-1935, I, 306 (no 48, lines 73-76). The reading and translation are not sure for the word *envirar*, but there is no difficulty with the rest.

⁷ See Jeanroy, *Poésie lyrique des troubadours*, Paris, 1934, I, 331.

⁸ Jeanroy, *op cit*, I, 384.

⁹ In his edition, II, 285, with a reference to his *Giraut de Bornelh, der Meister der Troubadours*, Berlin, 1894, p. 61.

Carret (1180-1230), celebrated by a number of troubadours. This would make Bernart a contemporary of Aimeric. The editor of the anonymous love letter suggests that it may be the work of Aimeric de Peguilhan. But his hypothesis is based chiefly on this comparison of the poet and his lady to an Assassin and the Old Man of the Mountain, so it is far from conclusive. Still, we shall probably not be far wrong in assuming that both these undated poems belong to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, as their language and style have nothing to imply either a very late or a very early date. Even Giraut's poem may be considerably later than Kolsen puts it (he says "vielleicht"), nothing in the poem itself seems to make a later date impossible, since all the datable persons referred to in it were alive at the end of the century (Dalfin d'Alvernha, 1169-1234, "Sobre-totz" or Raimon Bernart de Rovinhan, alive in 1197, it is not known when Eble de Saigna died, if indeed the *Eblon* of the poem refers to him) according to Kolsen's own listings in the *Ergennamen*. It is therefore not impossible that all these poems were written within a comparatively short space of time.

Where did the poets get their knowledge of the Assassins and the Old Man, and then interest in them? Oral reports from returning crusaders are a possible source. And the Latin historians of the day (e.g., William of Tyre) give various details about the sect, so does the *Chanson d'Antioche*, as revised by Graindor de Douai at the end of the twelfth century. The history of William of Tyre was translated into French (as the *Estovre d'Eracles*) around 1200, and became very popular in that form. All these, then, are possible sources.

But there is another, which seems to me even more likely. Toward the end of the twelfth century, there was in France quite a commotion about the Assassins. In 1192, Philip Augustus let it be known that he suspected Richard the Lion-Heart of having induced the Old Man of the Mountain to send some of the Assassins to France for the purpose of murdering him (Philip), and he redoubled his personal guard. This is recorded by several historians,¹⁰ and undoubtedly tickled the popular fancy. One thing that makes me connect it with these Provençal poems is the phrase used

¹⁰ See, for example, the *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, edited by Delaborde, Paris, 1882-85, I, 120-121, 195.

by Aimeric de Pegulhan "his Assassins, who go *even beyond France* to kill his enemies" This is at least an indication that there had been talk of the presence of Assassins in western Europe, and may well refer to this rumor The love letter and the poem of Bernart de Bondeilh, as we have seen, may or may not have been written at the same time as Aimeric's songs, and we have seen that Giraut's poem could conceivably have been written then also My own feeling, which is of course only a guess, is that all five poems were written shortly before or shortly after 1200, when the scare over the Assassins sent to kill the King was still fresh in the minds of the populace ¹¹

I have already mentioned two references in French to the Assassins, in works of a historical nature The examples given by Godefroy and Tobler-Lommatzsch in their dictionaries of Old French (and I have found no others) seem to be no earlier than the thirteenth century, and are for the most part factual references or colorless uses of the word *assassin* (in the later texts) as an equivalent for "murderer" The one case where a poet has used the fanaticism of the sect to illustrate the power of the Lady over the lover is the following

Ma dame cui je n'o nomeir,
 Mon cuer aveis, no u pui celler,
 Belle plaixans et coie,
 Por vos sui je jolis,
 Partir ne m'an poroie
 Vostre hons suix essescis ¹²

The last line could be translated "I am your Assassin liege-man" The poet wishes to imply, I presume, that he is as faithful to the lady as the Assassins to the Old Man of the Mountain I do not know that this poem can be dated, but it was evidently written under Provençal influence

¹¹ The two poems of Aimeric can be dated before 1212, since they are addressed to Spanish rulers, and in 1212 Aimeric was in Italy, never, as far as we know, to return to Spain We derive this date from the fact that Aimeric composed two *planhs* for Azzo VI of Este, who died in 1212

¹² From the Oxford *chansonnier* (MS Douce 308), fol 228b, published in Herrig's *Archiv*, vol. 99, p 352, no 48 I have quoted the complete stanza, and nothing that precedes or follows amplifies the allusion The punctuation and the interpretation that it implies are mine, as only a bare diplomatic text is given in the *Archiv* I take *n'o* to mean "I do not dare"

I do not know if the simile occurs in other literatures, I have not found it anywhere else. And, indeed, I should be surprised to find it except possibly in a poem imitated from the troubadours, for it illustrates admirably the extravagant cult of the Lady that began and came to fullest flowering with them.¹³

FRANK M. CHAMBERS

Northwestern University

RABELAIS AND THE GREEK DANCES

Although nearly every phase of Rabelais' rich erudition has been thoroughly explored, the investigation of musical ideas in *Gargantua and Pantagruel* is a field practically untouched. The sources of many such ideas are fairly obvious, others are more difficult to explain. Among the latter is the list of Greek dances performed at the court of Quint Essence by the Queen and her attendants

revoquans l'antiquité en usage, ils jouerent ensemble aux

Cordace,
Emmelie,
Sicinnie,
Iambicque,
Persique,
Phrygie,
Necatisme,
Thracie,

Calabrisme,
Molossicque,
Cernophore,
Mongas,
Thermanstrie,
Florale,
Pyrrhicque,
Et mille autres danses.¹

What prompted Rabelais—and we assume that he was largely responsible for the *Fifth Book*—to cite these particular dances in this particular order?

The more one studies Rabelais' writings, the more one comes to believe that the long enumerations which so delighted the jovial *médecin* were never a haphazard matter but were organized according to some plan, the logic of which was perhaps owing to the plan of an earlier "authority." It has been a rewarding task, then,

¹³ I am grateful to Professor Grace Frank for valuable suggestions in connection with this article. The author presented the substance of this paper at a meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, December, 1948.

¹ *Le Cinquiesme Livre*, ed. Jean Plattard (Paris, 1929), p. 72.

to find realization of this in tracing the list of dances to its source Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*, Book XIV, 629, d and e. The whole of this book is an informal discussion of various aspects of music, including a lengthy section on the dance. After treating the dance in general, Athenaeus lists specific dances according to category. Those of a stable nature, simple, and performed in close formation, he says, are the following:

δάκτυλοι, ἱαμβική, Μολοσσική ἐμμέλεια,
κόρδαξ, σίκιννις, Περσική, Φρύγιος νιβατισμός,
Θράκιος κολαβρισμός, τελεσιάς

Wild and furious are the *κερνοφόρος καὶ μογγὰς καὶ θερμανστρίς*. A dance with antiphonal singing (question and answer, roses and violets) is the *ἄνθεμα* (Flowers). And Athenaeus concludes a list of ludicrous dances with the word *πυρρήχη*—evidently an error for the *Pyrrhichê* is consistently described by ancient writers as a war dance, so even by Athenaeus in preceding and subsequent paragraphs (629 c and 630 d).

All fifteen of Rabelais' dances, thus, appear in this passage. Three adjectives in the Greek quotation, however (*Molossikê*, *Phrygios*, and *Thiakios*), become nouns in the French, and several words show errors in transliteration (*Nicastisme* for *Nibatismos*, *Calabrusme* for *Kolabrismos*, and *Thermanstine* for *Thermaustius*).²

The *mille autres danses* which the Queen and her court performed were suggested, doubtlessly, by the numerous other dances included in Athenaeus' discussion (629, e and f, 640 and 631). Transliterated, these are as follows:³ drunken dances—the *Iomkê*, *Angelê* (Messenger), *Kosmou ekpyrôsis* (World conflagration), ludicrous dances—*Igdîs* (Mortar pounding), *Maktisimos*, *Apokimos*, *Sobas*, *Morphasmos*, *Glaux* (Owl), *Leôn* (Lion), *Alphitôn ekchusis* (Pouring out the barley), *Chreôn apokopê* (Cancelling the debt), *Stocheia*, and *Pyrrichê*, aulos-accompanied dances—*Keleustou* (Boatswain's dance) and *Pinakida* (Platter dance), figure-dances—*Xiphismos* (Sword dance), *Kalathiskos* (Basket dance), *Kalla-*

² It would be interesting to compare the MS of the *Fifth Book* with Athenaeus' list. According to the *variorum* edition of Burgaud des Marets and Rathery (Paris, 1873), "Leur ordre [that of the dances] est different dans le manuscrit." See v, 407, note 6.

³ I am indebted to Miss Mary McCrimmon for checking the Greek words in this passage.

bides (Hip dance), *Skôps* (Owl), *Skôpeuma* (Owling), and a final (unclassified) group—*Theimaustis*, *Hekaterides*, *Skopos* (Look-out), *Cheir kataprênês* (Flat hand down), *Cheir simê*, *Dipodismos* (Two-step), *Xylou paralêpsis* (Grabbing the wood), *Epankônismos* (Cushion dance), *Kalathiskos* (Basket dance), *Strobilos* (Spinning top) Athenaeus follows these with the *Telesias* (Telesiad), a war dance, and the *Sikinnis* or satyr dance. A whole paragraph is devoted to the *Pyrrichê*, among the Spartans a preparatory drill for war and “in our times” Dionysiac in character, danced to high-pitched melodies. The *Gymnopaidikê* (Naked boy) finds its counterpart in the *Anapalê* (Wrestling) with its variations *Ôschophorikoi* (Vine dance) and *Bacchikoi* (Bacchic), all belonging to the cult of Dionysus. A choral dance sung by the performers is the *Hyporchêmatikê*, and the “best varieties of lyric poetry are those which are danced prosodiac, apostolic, and the like.”⁴ Concluding his discussion, Athenaeus compares several of the Greek dances with their counterparts “among the barbarians.”

In attempting to reconstruct the reasoning process which led Rabelais to choose the specific dances enumerated by him, one notices, first of all, that the kingdom of Quint Essence (whose very name is *Entelechie*) is thoroughly ancient in tone, filled with writers and philosophers of antiquity as well as a few “modern” humanists—Budé, Lascaris, Scaliger, and others. The retinue of the Queen’s ministers, all bearing Hebrew titles, emphasizes humanistic learning, as well as ideas dramatized at the court—healing the sick with music, for example, a practical application of Greek ideas of musical *ethos*. Consistent with this atmosphere, then, are ancient Greek dances for the entertainment of the court after dining—a Greek tradition in itself—rather than contemporaneous French dances (which are introduced under quite different circumstances elsewhere in the *Fifth Book*).

Rabelaisian enumerations, it seems, tend to place the most important and best known items first. So in the two groups of fifty-nine musicians in the New Prologue to the *Fourth Book* the most distinguished composers of the so-called Netherlandish Schools head the lists, with lesser *musici* following. Of the Greek dances, the first three are ones which were universally known and discussed

⁴ *Deipnosophists*, tr. Charles B. Gulick (Cambridge and London, 1927-1941), vi, 407.

in ancient writings and which appear sometimes in literature of the 16th century Athenaeus mentions and characterizes the *Cordax*, *Emmeleia*, and *Sikinnis* elsewhere in his *Deipnosophistae* (for example, Book I, 20) Lucian (second century A D), to mention only one other writer of late antiquity, discusses these in his treatise, *The Dance*, describing their origin from Dionysian rites and relating them to the drama which grew from these rites the *Emmeleia* was the tragic dance, the *Cordax* comic, and the *Sikinnis* characteristic of the satyr play These dances probably owed their survival to their association with the drama That they were known in Rabelais' century is witnessed by Jehan Tabourot whose book on the dance (1588) incorporates a conversation about them⁵ Capriole, the earnest young *discipulus* in Tabourot's dialogue, says that in his reading of ancient authors he has come upon three kinds of dances "one grave, called the *Emmeleia*, one, gay, which they name the *Cordax*, and one other, partaking of both gravity and gaiety, called the *Sikinnis*" To this Arbeau, the learned dancing master and musician, replies

Regarding ancient dances, I can say only that either the passing of time or the idleness of man, or the difficulty of describing them, has resulted in their being lost

It is true that we can compare the *Emmeleia* to our *Pavanes* and *Basses-Dances*, the *Cordax* to *Gaillardes*, *Tordions*, *Voltes*, *Courantes*, *Gavottes*, *Branles de Champagne* and *de Bourgogne*, *Branles Gais* and *Branles Coupes*, the *Sikinnis* to *Branles Doubles* and *Branles Simples*

Significant here is the fact that although Tabourot admitted his lack of knowledge about these now lost dances, he nonetheless emphasized the emotional idea characteristic of each dance in comparing each one with French dances of a similar nature—the *Emmeleia* to slow and solemn dances, the *Cordax* to fast dances involving twists and leaps, and the *Sikinnis* to the more stately of the various *Branles* Rabelais himself mentions the *Cordax* later in the *Fifth Book* (chap XXXIX) when he describes Silenus followed by a crowd "de jeunes gens champestres . . . toujours chantans et dansans les cordaces"

After beginning with the best known of the ancient dances, Rabelais in his list cites five *verbatim* from Athenaeus' list, framing them with two others (also found in Athenaeus) whose names ob-

⁵ Jehan Tabourot (Thoinot Arbeau), *Orchesography* (Langres, 1588), tr Cyril W Beaumont (London, 1925), p 21.

viously derived from poetic meters—the *Iambic* and *Molossic* (Rabelais omitted the *Daktyloi*, first in Athenaeus' list, and the *Telesias*, last in this group) Four more dances appear in Athenaeus' order, and the list ends with a dance frequently mentioned in the literature of antiquity—the warlike *Pyrrichê* Xenophon (fourth century B C) tells of seeing a woman equipped with a light buckler perform the Pyrrhic Dance (*Anabasis*, VI, 1), Lucian in *The Dance* tells that its inventor was the son of Achilles, a youth famed for his dancing, and Athenaeus devotes a large part of his discussion to this dance, attributing its origin to Spartan military rites and citing several earlier "authorities" on historic performances of it The *Pyrrichê* also appears in Tabourot's *Orchésographie*, for the student Capriole, in his reference to ancient writers, concludes with the statement, "They make mention also of the dance called the *Pyrrhic*", and the *magister* Arbeau, comparing Greek and French dances, relates "the *Pyrrhic* to the dance we call *Bouffons* or *Mattachins*"⁶ Later Arbeau describes the *Pyrrhic* as an armed dance performed "with clashing of swords and bucklers, to an air in duple time" and he gives an "Air of the *Bouffons*" characterized by Pyrrhic meter ($\overline{\text{J}}\overline{\text{J}}$ $\overline{\text{J}}\overline{\text{J}}$)⁷

The three opening dances and the closing dance in Rabelais' list are, thus, points of reference, known by name, at least, to the cultivated reader Intermediate dances, far less celebrated if indeed known at all, follow the source in almost exact order, with variations from that order—the insertion of the metrically-named dances—following a definite plan At first glance, it may seem strange that Rabelais, having named fifteen dances, ends without following the source to its conclusion, for Rabelais was never one to shy away from a lengthy enumeration, lavishly piling fact upon fact, detail upon detail Athenaeus' account of the dances, however, suggests a reason for this abruptness The *mille autres danses* were probably so designated because Athenaeus' description shows them to be, for the most part, of a ludicrous, licentious, or drunken nature, obviously unsuited for performance at the dignified court of *Entelechie*, of Quint Essence

NAN COOKE CARPENTER

Montana State University

⁶ *Ibid*

⁷ *Ibid*, pp 153 and 157

"WILD BELLS" IN BAILEY'S *FESTUS*¹

On November 12, 1846, Tennyson wrote to Fitzgerald "I have just got *Festus*, order it and read You will most likely find it a great bore, but there are really *very grand* things in *Festus*"¹ Since Philip James Bailey's once-famous poem was first published in 1839, one hesitates to infer that Tennyson did not read it before 1846 More probably he has been rereading it in the enlarged second edition of 1845

One of the "very grand things" may have been the long prayer delivered by Festus, which, though characteristically verbose and turgid, constitutes a complete catalogue of early-Victorian aspirations² We are reminded of "Ring out, wild bells" (*In Memoriam*, CVI) by Festus's words

The bells of time are ringing changes fast
Grant, Lord, that each fresh peal may usher in
An era of advancement, that each change
Prove an effectual, lasting, happy gain

Observe the punning application of the technical phrase "ringing changes" to the idea of beneficent *social* changes These are not the opening lines of the prayer, but any reader would be inclined to interpret them as its governing metaphor The exact date of "Ring out, wild bells" is unknown, but its position and function in *In Memoriam* agree well enough with the conjecture that it was written about the time of Tennyson's letter to Fitzgerald.

Tennyson and Bailey desire almost exactly the same "changes"

Ring out the feud of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind

Festus prays for social justice and a stronger sense of mutual obligation between higher and lower classes

¹ Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Lord Tennyson A Memoir* (New York, 1898), I, 234 Italics are Tennyson's The implication is not that *Festus* is mainly tedious, but that Fitzgerald, whose literary tastes were notoriously fastidious and crotchety, would perversely find it so

² Philip James Bailey, *Festus* (London, 1860), pp 59-66 Bailey does not number acts and scenes, and I know of no edition in which the lines are numbered.

Oh! may all help each other in good things,
Mentally, morally, and bodily

He hopes that the development of science and invention may

lighten labour,
And give more room to mind, and leave the poor
Some time for self-improvement

Tennyson bids the bells

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of *party strife*,
Ring in the *nobler modes* of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws

Festus hopes that God will

override
All civil contests to the good of all,
All *party* and religious difference
To honourable ends, whether secured
Or lost, and let all *strife*, political
Or social, spring from conscientious aims,

and that the common people

may be trained,
From their youth upwards, in a *nobler mode*,
To loftier and more liberal ends

Observe especially the words which I have italicized

Tennyson

Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
The faithless coldness of the times

The entire *Festus* passage is based on the idea that a stronger, purer
faith is prerequisite to all social betterment For example

. and we pray
That men may rule themselves in faith in God,
In charity to each other, and in hope
Of their own soul’s salvation

Tennyson would have his bells

Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slander and the spite,
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good

This substantially repeats the thought of an earlier stanza which, as we have seen, finds a parallel in *Festus*. The entire Bailey passage is suffused with the spirit of Christian Socialism, as when God is asked to grant that all ranks and callings "May mingle into one," and

that all laws
And powers of government be based and used
In good, and for the people's sake

Tennyson's bells are to "Ring in the thousand years of peace" Similarly *Festus* prays

That all mankind may make one brotherhood,
And love and serve each other, that all wars
And feuds die out of nations

This section of *In Memoriam* culminates in the lines

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand,
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be

Here the perfected man of the future seems to be identified with the Christ of Broad Churchmanship. A very similar idea is expressed by Bailey in the aspiration that the people of the world, merged in a social unity,

may so do
As is most worthy of the next to God,
For a whole people's souls, each one worth more
Than a mere world of matter, make combined
A something godlike—something like to Thee

And in concluding his intercession *Festus* prays that

the great world shall be at last
The mercy-seat of God, the heritage
Of Christ, and the possession of the Spirit

One is tempted, then, to regard "Ring out, wild bells" as a condensed and rapid lyrical version of Bailey's long-winded rhetorical treatment of the same theme. But even if the prayer of *Festus* should be regarded as a parallel rather than a source, it enriches our understanding of the Victorian background of Tennyson's lines

HOXIE N FAIRCHILD

CAXTON'S ORIGINAL ADDITIONS TO THE
LEGENDA AUREA

Caxton's monumental edition of the *Legenda Aurea* differs in many respects from the original Latin. In earlier studies I have pointed out the extent to which his version was influenced by the work of his predecessors, an anonymous English translator and a French redactor.¹ On the negative side, as I have shown, Caxton's text is marked by omission, condensation, distortion, and error. On the positive side, it contains some original passages which it is the purpose of this paper to set forth.²

In addition to the prologue and epilogue, four such expansions have already been recognized by Crotch as original.³ They may be briefly indicated. In *S. George*, the last paragraph, beginning "This blessed and holy martyr S. George is patron of this realm of England and the cry of men of war" Caxton here mentions the Order of the Garter and the relic of the saint at Windsor Castle (III, 133-134).⁴ In *David*, the passage telling of the prophet's penance and the composition of the Miserere, beginning, "For as I was once beyond the sea riding in the company of a noble knight named Sir John Capons . . ." and ending, "Thus this nobleman told me, riding between the town of Ghent in Flanders and the town of Brussels in Brabant" (I 33-34). In *S. Austin*, the anecdote of the child by the seaside, beginning, "Many other miracles hath God showed by his life and also after his death which were overlong to write in this book . . ." This is the last passage in the chapter (V 65-66). In the *Circumcision*, the passage beginning "Also it is said that it is in the church of Our

¹ 'Caxton's *Golden Legend* and Varagine's *Legenda Aurea*' *Speculum* XXI (1946) 212-221, 'Caxton's *Golden Legend* and De Vignai's *Légende Dorée*' *Mediaeval Studies*, 1946, pp. 97-106, 'Caxton and the Synfulle Wretche' *Traditio* IV (1946) 423-428.

² Because I am here concerned with the printer's own composition, I omit reworked and newly translated material such as the chapters on the Old Testament and the life of S. Rock.

³ *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* (EETS, 176) 70-76.

⁴ F. S. Ellis, *The Golden Legend or Lives of the Saints as Englished by William Caxton* (London, 1931). All quotations from Caxton are from this edition.

Lady at Antwerp in Brabant" down to the sentence, "If it be true, to some it seemeth marvel . ." (I, 40)

Besides the foregoing, three other passages appear to be Caxton's own additions to the *Legenda*. Two of them contain a significant reference to the writer's visit to Cologne. Since these portions of his *Golden Legend* have not hitherto been attributed to Caxton, I shall give them in full.

1 In *S Ursula*, after giving Varagine's statement that the martyrdom of the Virgins may have occurred in the reign of Marcian, in the year 452, the printer inserts the following sentences:

It is to be remembered among these eleven thousand virgins were many men, for the pope Cyriacus and other bishops, and Etheus king, with other lords and knights, had much people to serve them. And as I have been informed in Cologne that there were men besides women that thilke time suffered martyrdom, fifteen thousand. So the number of this holy multitude, as of the holy virgins and men, were twenty six thousand, to whom let us pray to our Lord that he have mercy on us. (VI, 67) ⁵

2 At the end of the *Nativity of Our Lord*, he writes:

This feast of Nativity of our Lord is one of the greatest feasts of all the year, and for to tell all the miracles that our Lord hath showed, it should contain a whole book, but at this time I shall leave and pass over save one thing that I have heard once preached of a worshipful doctor, that what person being in clean life desire on this day a boon of God, as far as it is rightful and good for him, our Lord at the reverence of this blessed high feast of his Nativity will grant it to him. Then let us always make us in clean life at this feast that we may so please him, that after this short life we may come unto his bliss. Amen. (I, 28)

3 To these passages should be added the rather long one at the end of the *Nativity of Our Lady*:

Then let us continually give laud and praising to her as much as we may, and let us say with S. Jerome this response: Sancta et immaculata virginitas. And how this holy response was made, I purpose, under correction, to write here. It is so that I was at Cologne, and heard rehearsed there by a noble doctor that the holy and devout S. Jerome had a custom to visit the churches at Rome. And so he came into a church where an image of our blessed Lady stood in a chapel by the door as he entered, and passed forth without any salutation to our Lady, and went forth to every

⁵ Donald Attwater, *A Dictionary of Saints* (New York, 1938), p. 299: 'There is no reason to suppose that Ursula's companions numbered more than a few. Her feast is now treated with considerable reserve in the Roman liturgy and it was a project of Pope Benedict XIV to suppress it altogether, as the Benedictines have done.'

altar and made his prayers to all the saints in the church, each after other, and returned again by the same image without any saluting to her. Then our blessed Lady called him and spake to him by the said image, and demanded of him the cause why he made no salutation to her, seeing that he had done honor and worship to all the other saints of whom the images were in that church. And then S. Jerome kneeled down and said thus: 'Sancta et immaculata virginitas, quibus te laudibus referam nescio. Quia quem celi capere non poterant, tuo gremio contulisti.'⁶ Which is to say: Holy and undefiled virginity, I wot never what laud and praises I shall give to thee. For him that all the heavens might not take nor contain, thou hast borne in thy womb. So with this holy man thought himself insufficient to give to her laud, then what shall we sinful wretches do but put us wholly in her mercy, acknowledging us insufficient to give to her due laud and praising? But let us meekly beseech her to accept our good intent and will, and that by her merits we may attain after this life to come to her in everlasting life in heaven. Amen. (v, 110-111)

Should not these three examples of Caxton's informal style be included in future reprintings of Crotch's work and in other collections of the writings of the first English printer?

SISTER MARY JEREMY

Rosary College,
River Forest, Ill

MEDIEVAL CHESS AND THE BOOK OF THE DUCHESS

In a recent issue of this publication, Professor Franklin D. Cooley attempted to explain the terms used in the game of chess played by Chaucer's Man in Black with the goddess Fortune.¹ Its central incident was her capture of his queen by a stealthy maneuver, whereupon he resigned in despair, much as might a modern master after a similar loss. Professor Cooley believes that this was a natural act: that the event was a disaster, and "the medieval game must frequently have ended with the loss of the queen."² Yet this was not the belief of Chaucer's Dreamer, the first response of

⁶ This is the first responsory after the first lesson in the Common Office for feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary. *Sarum Breviary*, Fasciculus II, col. 298, *Servitium Beatae Mariae ab Octavis Epiphaniae usque ad Purificationem*.

¹ "Two Notes on the Chess Terms in the *Book of the Duchess*," *MLN* LXIII (January, 1948), 30-35.

² P. 31.

his practical intellect was surprise that the Man in Black should have given up prematurely

In attempting to decide between the two, we must first admit that we know very little about the course of the medieval game. It seems to have developed by collision of forces rather than by attacks at long distance, the openings were rather slow in forming, and a player might win by capturing all the hostile pieces and pawns except the king. But almost everything else, including the proposition that losing the queen was equivalent to losing the game, is little more than inference. Theorists did indeed counsel that the piece be retained to guard the king against checks, but they nowhere stated whether she must thereby become the last piece to be lost before resignation.

In fact, there is clear evidence to the contrary. Only one game has survived nearly complete from medieval times, and there one queen had disappeared five moves before the final mate.³ Furthermore, in writings of Arab theorists are many end-game compositions, "which bear every sign of having occurred in play over the board."⁴ From them the queen is frequently absent. Of the first thirty-six, for instance, one queen is missing in nineteen, both are missing in five, and both remain in only twelve.⁵ Now since under the rules then prevailing, they moved only upon diagonals of their own color, they could not have been exchanged for each other, hence those that were not lost through inferior play must have disappeared in exchanges for other pieces or pawns. Far from being conserved until the end, they could be absent from two endings out of three, and still the situation was regarded as playable and the outcome by no means clear unless the opponent played perfectly.

Just how small was the value of the queen in medieval chess is apparent from calculations by teachers of the game. Says the *Ennsiedeln Poem* (before 1100): "The Knights and Rooks are the chief fighting forces. When they are taken, the battle soon dies,

³ Given in part by H. J. R. Murray, *A History of Chess* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 478 ff. Joseph Mettlich's full account is not available to me.

⁴ Murray, p. 276. The Arab game was the same as that played in England and France: see Murray, p. 394.

⁵ Murray, pp. 282-284.

they should be carefully guarded" ⁶ An Arab reckoned a queen as worth slightly more than a bishop, or the king's pawn, or the queen's pawn, but not half so valuable as a rook, and about half a knight ⁷ Another advised exchanging her for two marginal pawns—further proof that early exchange was believed advantageous Still a third, calculating the chances in games at odds, reckoned the rook the hardest piece to dispense with, then the knight, then the queen, which was only a little less expendable than the bishop ⁸

These matters become important because they affect the interpretation of the *Book of the Duchess* Had the Dreamer believed that loss of the queen was fatal to one's game, he must have been jesting when he made light of it We shall be far more reasonable if we suppose that actually he regarded it as a minor incident because he knew that almost any experienced player would have continued to play, trusting that his rooks and knights would still win the battle

In this respect, he was an admirable foil for his fellow-disputant Chaucer's poem, it should be remembered, is developed, at least in its early stages, by a series of learned equivocations For although the Man in Black refuses to bare his heart to a stranger, he is too courteous to brush off any one so obviously well-intentioned ⁹ He therefore devises the ingenious expedient of telling the truth in such fancy language that it may seem no revelation whatever He produces in turn a rant, a conventional denunciation of Fortune, and an allegory, all with puzzling effect Then, won over by the Dreamer's obviously genuine concern for his sorrow, he turns to a high-flown variety of plain speech in his description of meeting Blanche Here he explains clearly enough why the loss of a queen, to most medieval players a matter of small concern, was to him so

⁶ Murray, p 498

⁷ Murray, p 227

⁸ Murray, p 232 Against such opinions, Professor Cooley sets the testimony of one short poem, which in spite of its profession to teach the game, is really an imaginative description, not a practical text In the *Elegie de Ludo Scachorum* (after 1100), amid other fanciful remarks, is this "When [the king] loses his wife, there is nothing of any value left on the board" (Murray, p 516) But Murray believed this work too unreliable to be taken seriously (p 504)

⁹ *Book of the Duchess*, ll 529 ff

serious that with the game only half over, he took no further interest, but laid himself open to a deadly check from behind.¹⁰

W. H. FRENCH

Cornell University

CHAUCER'S *KANKEDORT* [*TROILUS AND CRISEYDE*
II, 1752]

"Etymology not ascertained"

In annotating his great edition of Chaucer's works, Walter William Skeat devoted some attention to *kankedort* before confessing that his efforts were vain, "nor do we even know how to divide it"¹

When the editors of the *Oxford English Dictionary* came to the task of writing up this nonce-word, they threw up their hands on the etymology, no doubt despairing of success where Skeat had failed

As you can well imagine, I too made a good many futile efforts to solve this little mystery, tinkering with one possibility or another until a better one presented itself, always bearing in mind the standard definition as adopted in F. N. Robinson's edition "a state of suspense, or difficult position."²

Still in the frame of mind described by Skeat, I had about decided to relegate the problem to my inactive files, when a fresh clue was stumbled upon while I was turning the pages of the great encyclopedia by Vincent of Beauvais. Chapter 35 of Book 15 of the *Speculum naturale*, it appeared, was devoted to the meanings of the names of the signs of the zodiac, a topic as irrelevant to my concerns as anything could well be. Still, I looked at it—and there was the clue which is responsible for my taking up your time here for it seems that the reason that a place in the heavens was called

¹⁰ In *Chaucer and His Poetry* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1915), G. L. Kittredge proposed that the entire conversation was artificially prolonged—that both parties really understood the fact of Blanche's death and its relation to chess, but that each for his own reasons pretended the Dreamer did not. There is nothing in the laws of medieval chess to encourage this interpretation

¹ *Troilus and Criseyde*, notes, in the *Oxford Chaucer* ² II (1900), p. 473

² *The Complete works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 1933.

Cancer [Latin for "crab"] is that just as a crab goes backward, so the sun coming into [the area of] this sign turns its course backward³ This medieval notion became firmly fixed, as shown by a similar statement quoted in the *Oxford English Dictionary* under the date 1859 "Cancer perhaps the Zodiacal sign was so called because the sun begins to return back when it enters this sign, and its retrograde motion may be represented by that of a crab"⁴

Thus my attention was directed to L *cancer* 'crab,' a loan-word present in ME as early as 1100, long before the term became applied to the dreaded disease which it calls to our minds, the disease which was named *cancer* because of the supposed resemblance of the dangerous sores to the shape of the crustacean Now many of the shell-fish, including the crab, have the convenient faculty of moving backward or forward with equal facility and without having to turn about when reversing direction To medieval—and a few later—men, the sun seemed to do this very thing when in the astronomical "house" of the sign of the crab, about the time of the summer solstice What actually happens, a colleague in astronomy conveniently informs me, is that the sun does not turn back upon its course, but simply proceeds so much more slowly than when in other "houses" that to the casual observer the illusion of reversal might be possible

The impression, right or wrong, that the sun turned back when in the sign of the crab, thus appearing to hesitate in a kind of uncertainty, provided enough agreement with the standard definition of *kankedort* to encourage me to proceed to the variant readings recorded in Robert Kilburn Root's great edition of *Troilus and Criseyde*⁵

It seems that no less than four important MSS have the reading *kankerdorte* These seem to bring us comfortably closer to Vincent than does the accepted form *kankedort*, and moreover *kankerdorte* leads one inevitably to think of the familiar Early Modern English *cankered*, "infected with canker," "eaten by a cankerworm"⁶

³ *Speculum naturale* (Duaci 1624) Liber xv cap xxxv "Quantum Cancer, & significat quod sicut Cancer retrocedit, sic Sol ad illud signum veniens cursum suum retroflectit"

⁴ OED s v *cancer* sb 2 b.

⁵ Princeton, 1926, p 140, 458

⁶ OED s v *cankered* ppl a 3 No forms are listed within the dates of Chaucer's lifetime

Sound lexicographical practice is spared an unduly violent wrench if we venture to postulate a Middle English **cankered* meaning *crab-like*. If we do this, maybe we know at least what Skeat said he couldn't find out, "how to divide it." Suppose we divide it into **cankered* and *ort*.

Ort proved easier than it looks at first, for it stands for a word which appears in many if not most of the Germanic or Celtic dialects in one variant or other. Orientation in this detail must not detain us here, space sufficing only to say that the most likely etymon of the *-ort* in *kankedorst* as I have settled upon it is Middle Dutch *oord*, *oort*, meaning "place, country, region, quarter".⁷

This word existed for many years in English. The *Oxford Dictionary* cites occurrences appearing from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, and every student of OE has learned to translate it as that part of a weapon called now the point—a meaning well established in the British Isles for a half-dozen centuries or more. I resort to Holland for the meaning which applies here: place, country, region, quarter.

Chaucer's *kankedorst*, var *kankerdorte*, then, is divided *kankered*, *ort*. The meanings of these two words combine to give us something like "region (or area) where crab-like or uncertain behavior prevails." In the heavens, that region or area where crab-like behavior prevails took on the name of the crab, L. *cancer*, and therefore, my speculation is that this nonce-word interpreted the seemingly vacillating, hesitating or crab-like behavior of the sun during the summer solstice. Thus the feeling of intimidated uncertainty in which Troilus finds himself as Book II closes is fittingly bracketed with the supposedly like situation of the sun in Cancer. Strikingly appropriate it is, you will agree, that the author of *A treatise on the Astrolabe* should use this recondite expression culled once only from the field of astronomy.⁸

JOHN WEBSTER SPARGO

Northwestern University

⁷ Verwijs & Verdam, *Woordenboek der nederlandsche Taal*, XI (1910)

⁸ v

^a For Chaucer's discussion of the sun in the sign of cancer, see *A treatise* . . . § 17.

SAUL'S PRIDE (*PURG* XII 40-42)

It seems that no sufficient explanation has been given, either by ancient or by modern commentators, for the inclusion of Saul among the examples of *superbia* carved as bas-reliefs into the marble ground of the first girone of the *Purgatorio*. For the reader not familiar with the details of mediaeval interpretation of the Bible, Saul's wickedness seems rather to be envy or a kind of wrathful melancholy than pride (*tristitia* and *ira*, cf. *Inferno* VII and VIII). Jacopo della Lana, the Anonimo Fiorentino, Francesco Buti and Pietro Alighieri give very general and insufficient explanations of his *superbia*, such as "because he fought against David," or "because he did not wish to be captured alive by the Philistines." Benvenuto da Imola and the Ottimo, while recording the whole story of Saul, mention the facts which contain the solution of the problem, but they do not stress them as the important ones.

In Christian ethics *superbia* is linked with the original sin and disobedience to God. By his pride, i.e. by preferring his own will to the order of God, Adam committed the disobedience which caused the fall of man.¹ Thus, the first examples of pride in *Purgatorio* XII and several of the following ones are examples of disobedience to God or contempt of divine power.

This disobedience, caused by pride, was committed by Saul when he acted against the will of God announced to him by Samuel first by offering the sacrifice before the arrival of Samuel (1 *Sam* 13, 8-14)—and even more when he spared the life of Agag, the king of Amalec, and saved from destruction the best of the booty, against the express orders of God (1 *Sam* 15). From that moment God abandons him and confers the kingdom upon another, upon David, from that moment God sends him "the evil spirit" who darkens his life. All commentators, such as Gregory the Great,² the Pseudo-Eucherius,³ Walafrid Strabo⁴ and Rupert of Deutz⁵ agree

¹ Cf. e.g. Thomas Aq., *Summa theol.* II IIae, quaestio 105, 2, ad 3.

² In 1 *Reg. Expositio*, lib. VI, *Patr. Lat.* LXXIX, col. 347-48, 417, 421 et seq.

³ *Comm. in Libr. Regum*, lib. I, *Patr. Lat.* I, col. 1059, 1064.

⁴ *Comm. in Libr. Reg.*, in lib. I, *Patr. Lat.* CIX, col. 41 et seq.

⁵ *De Trinitate et operibus eius*, in *Reg. libr. I*, cap. XX, *Patr. Lat.* CLXVII, 1088.

in considering these disobediences as *superbia* and as the cause of Saul's misfortunes and his final ruin. They all stress Samuel's words (1 *Sam* 15, 17) *Nonne cum parvulus esses in oculis tuis* etc., and Gregory says *Aperte ergo transgressor per inobedientiam extitit, quia implere verbum Domini per superbiam recusavit*. There are even several comparisons with and allusions to the original sin, e. g. in the commentary of Walafrid Strabo.

I wish to add still another point, which is only an hypothesis, it seems interesting to me because of the general principle involved—a principle rather strange for modern minds, but indispensable for the understanding of mediaeval *figuralism*.

In every example, Dante reports the punishment of pride, therefore, the mentioning of Saul's death needs no explanation, and the last verse, *che poi non senti pioggia nè rugiada*, may have been added for pure convenience, because Dante needed a verse with the rhyme of *-ada*. But Dante rarely fills gaps of this kind with a meaning that is only atmospherical and not also concrete. I suggest that in the last verse there is an allusion to another example of pride—a much more important one. In many commentaries of David's attitude after Saul's death (2 *Sam* 1)—when he orders the death of the man who boasts of having killed Saul, when he laments over Saul's death and curses the mountains of Gilboa—Saul is considered, in spite of his sins, as the Lord's anointed *quomodo non timuisti mittere manum tuam ut occideres christum Domini*, says David (2 *Sam* 1 14). Therefore, Saul is interpreted as a figure of Christ, his death becomes a prefiguration of the Passion, and the mountains of Gilboa mean the arrogant hearts (*superbia corda*) of the Jews who reject his message on whom the dew or rain of Divine Grace will never fall and who will never bear the first fruits of the field. I quote the commentary falsely ascribed to Eucherrus,⁶ which paraphrases a passage from St. Gregory:⁷

Scire enim debes, quia veraciter Saul, qui post unctionem Sancti Chrismatis, a quo et *Christus Domini* vocatus est, occidi meruit, mortem veri Christi, quam sine culpa subire dignatus est, insinuat, montes quoque Gelboe, in quibus interit, superbos Iudaeae plebis conatus, quibus contra auctorem vitae rebellabant, insinuant, propter quod eis merito optatur, ne rorem de coelo pluviamque suscipiant, quod hodie videmus expletum, in eo

⁶ *Loc cit* col 1080

⁷ *Moralia* IV, *In cap III Iob*; *Patr Lat* LXXV, 636. Cf. Walafrid Strabo, *loc cit* col 73, and Rupert of Deutz, *loc cit* col 1120

quod illos gratia coelestis deserens ad plebem gentium translata est
De quibus et benedicatur, ut agri primitiarum esse non possint Superbae
quippe Hebraeorum mentes primitivos fructus non ferunt, quia in Redemp-
toris adventu ex parte maxima in perfidia remanentes, primordia fidei
sequi noluerunt

The principle involved, which seems strange to modern minds, is the principle of "polysemy" in the figurative interpretation it very often considers, as in our case, the same person in morally contradictory meanings The same Saul who has been rejected for his *superbia* appears as *figura Christi*. The Pseudo-Eucherius continues

Nec tibi absurdum videri debet, ut mala reproborum acta aliquid boni significant, aut rursum bona justorum opera in contraria significatione ponantur Lege Moralia sancti papae Gregorii, et videbis quia usitatissimum est in Scripturis, ut et bona in malorum significatione accipiantur, et e converso .

ERICH AUERBACH

The Pennsylvania State College

THE CHEERYBLE BROTHERS A FURTHER NOTE

A close student of humanity, Dickens peopled his fiction with the Englishmen whom he met on the streets, in the coaches, and at the inns Whether they were only casual acquaintances or friends of long standing, they might eventually find places in his gallery of pen-portraits, some of them caricatured and pilloried without scruple, others showered with elaborate encomium To the latter category belong the benevolent Cheerybles of *Nicholas Nickleby*. That the prototypes of these philanthropic brothers were William and Daniel Grant, two prominent Manchester merchants whom Dickens had met in the winter of 1838, has long been accepted¹ Hitherto, however, no one has commented on two curious misstatements which the novelist made with respect to these brothers nine years after the publication of the work immortalizing them² A consideration of these discrepancies is the purpose of this note.

¹ For a fairly full account of the Grants see *James Nasmyth, Engineer An Autobiography*, ed Samuel Smiles (New York Harper and Brothers, 1883), pp 193-197

² The first edition of *Nicholas Nickleby* appeared in 1839, following the serial publication

Writing in 1848, when the popular *Nicholas Nickleby* was to appear in another edition, the author declared in the preface

I believe the application for loans, gifts, and offices of profit, that I have been requested to forward to the original of the Brothers Cheeryble (with whom I never interchanged any communication in my life), would have exhausted the combined patronage of the Lord Chancellors since the accession of the House of Brunswick, and would have broken the Rest of the Bank of England

The Brothers are now dead

A careful examination of this quotation reveals two startling inaccuracies. First, it should be remembered that Dickens had met the Grants in 1838. In reality, therefore, the statement "with whom I never interchanged any communication" has no basis in fact, unless the novelist meant that he had not carried on any written correspondence with the brothers. He certainly had conversed with them when he was honored at a dinner in Manchester at which they were present. But even more arresting is the avowal (in 1848) that the "Brothers are now dead." Actually, at this time only one of the pair, William Grant, was deceased. According to the memorial tablets placed in the Manchester Presbyterian Church founded by the brothers, William died February 28, 1842, Daniel, March 12, 1855. Daniel had before him, in 1848, seven more years in which to practice the famous charities which he and his brother had begun.

In the light of Dickens's own prefatory statement concerning the deluge of requests for aid, the reason for this strange misrepresentation of fact is obvious. Already annoyed and embarrassed by the piles of letters which he had been asked to forward to the originals of the Cheerybles, the novelist realized that the new, the so-called "cheap," edition would reach even more readers among the underprivileged. To preclude the possibility of loosing another torrent of mail, "Boz" boldly announced that the Cheerybles were dead, even though one of the brothers was still living. One cannot help wondering whether this misstatement ever came to the attention of Daniel Grant.

ARTHUR A. ADRIAN

Western Reserve University

A NOTE ON *THE WINDHOVER*

Professor Samuel C Chew, in his section "The Nineteenth Century and After" of *A Literary History of England*,¹ has committed an unfortunate error which requires correction. Professor Chew speaks of Hopkins's "ugly device of the 'run-over' rime"² He continues, in a footnote,

Thus in *The Windhover*, one of the poems most extravagantly admired, Hopkins uses a "run-over" rime and in the next line a violent stress upon a light syllable, so that the first syllable of "kingdom" rimes with the second syllable of "riding"³

If we re-examine "The Windhover," however, we discover that the rhyme scheme is that of a Petrarchan sonnet, *abba abba cdcdcd*. I quote the first four lines of the poem

I caught this morning morning's minion, king
dom of daylight's dauphin, dapple dawn drawn Falcon, in his riding
Of the rolling level underneath him steady air, and striding
High there, how he rung upon the rein of a wimpling wing

Since the Petrarchan rhyme scheme is the only one employed by Hopkins in any of his published sonnets (he sometimes varies the rhyme scheme of the sestet but never that of the octave), and since there exists no sonnet form in English with the sort of rhyme scheme (*aabb*?) which Professor Chew seems to be looking for in "The Windhover," we can only believe that Professor Chew has simply failed to recognize the poem as a sonnet.

It may be hazarded that closer attention to matters of conventional form in the poetry of Hopkins may help remove from that poet the stigma of *lusus naturae*, and help re-establish him within the boundaries of late-Victorian poetic tradition.

PAUL FUSSELL, JR

Cambridge, Mass

¹ Edited by Albert C. Baugh (New York, 1948)

² *Ibid.*, p. 1537

³ *Ibid.*, n. 20

⁴ *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (edited by Robert Bridges) (London, 1931), p. 29

FURTHER NOTE ON THE THIRTY POINTS OF WOMAN'S BEAUTY

The recent remarks by Professors Allen Gilbert and Archer Taylor¹ concerning the sixteenth century literary convention of enumerating the points of beauty in a woman show the need for complete investigation of the subject. May one not suggest 1) further study of the sources of Ariosto's description of Alcina, 2) a possible connection of the enumeration with the French *blasons* of the sixteenth century, and 3) comparison of Nevizzano's poem with the enumerative poems in classical antiquity?²

In none of the collections mentioned by Professor Taylor is to be found the following close imitation of Nevizzano. It is one of the poems inserted by Jacques Gohory into the *Trezieme Livre d'Amadis de Gaule*. It occurs in Chapter LVI and is entitled "Chanson de la Beauté"

Quiconque veult les trente beautés veoir,
Pentasilée y sert de vray miroir
Blanche est sa chair, ses dents, blonds ses cheveux
Ses sourcils noirs, noire chose et les yeux
Vermeils la bouche et joue et ongles sont,
Longs les cheveux et mains et le corps long,
Le ventre court, courte oreille et dentée
Large le front, l'entre œil et la croisée
La chose estroite et bouche et le corsage
Lèvre grosse et la fesse et cuissage
Les doigts menuz, le nez, le poil ainsi
Le chef petit, le tetin pied aussi
La Dame ayant ces trente points en elle
Dire se peut la parfaitement belle
Telle on disoit l'antique Heleine à Troye
Qui ne le croit Pentasilée il voye³

W. H. BOWEN

The University of Oklahoma

¹ *MLN* LXII, 129-130, LXIII, 61

² For example Virgil, *Georgics*, VII, 73-75, "Nec non et pecori est idem delectus equino"

³ *Trezieme Livre*, Paris, Lucas Breyer, 1571, fol. 334-334 vo

THE GHOST OF SWIFT IN *FOUR QUARTETS*

The hitherto unidentified ghost that speaks in the second part of "Little Gidding," in T S Eliot's *Four Quartets*,¹ "will provide the backbone for one hundred American theses," B Rajan predicts, "and as far as present knowledge can tell is Dante, Mallarmé, and Arnaut Daniel put together"² When the American theses are written, however, they will have to identify that ghost with Jonathan Swift In acknowledging a conscious reference to Swift in nine lines of the ghost's monologue, Mr Eliot adds that it is a reference which associates Swift with W B Yeats³

impotence of rage
At human folly, and the laceration
Of laughter at what ceases to amuse
And last, the rending pain of re enactment
Of all that you have done, and been, the shame
Of motives late revealed, and the awareness
Of things ill done and done to others' harm
Which once you took for exercise of virtue
Then fools' approval stings, and honour stains⁴

MAURICE JOHNSON

Syracuse University

REVIEWS

Die geistlichen Prozessionsspiele in Deutschland, von WOLFGANG F MICHAEL Hesperia, Studies in Germanic Philology, Nr 22 Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947 Pp 79.

The purpose of Michael's monograph is to discover the origin and to trace the development of all the so-called processional church plays of the late Middle Ages in Germany, for which any considerable amount of contemporary data has been preserved.

Michael's position as regards the origin is diametrically opposed

¹ New York, 1943 33-35

² "The Unity of the Quartets" in *T S Eliot A Study of His Writings by Several Hands* (ed B Rajan), London, 1947 93

³ In a letter to the present writer, dated June 27, 1947

⁴ "Little Gidding" in *Four Quartets*, New York, 1943 35

to that of Sengpiel (see Michael, *Verzeichnis*, p. 78), who claims that these plays developed out of the procession. Michael, on the other hand, finds the start in the text—"In the beginning was the Word" is his motto. His claim, put very briefly, is that the origin of these plays lies in the simpler forms of the older plays of the Three Kings (Magi). It is based largely upon two documents, one from Milan, dated 1336, for which no text has survived, merely a rather full description, the other from Fribourg, Switzerland. The text of this has been published (1903), but is not readily accessible. It might well have added greatly to the strength of Michael's argument had he included a new edition of this text. For it is a very unusual piece, part (the processional element) in German, based very closely upon the Vulgate version, and part (the actual offering, hymns, reading of the Gospel for the day with divided roles) in Latin. Stranger still, it seems to have formed an integral part of the Mass—"in loco offertorii."

Unfortunately practically nothing seems to be known regarding the conditions under which this very unusual play was given. Even the date is uncertain, nor is anything said about the continuity of the performances. To be sure, mention is made, quite incidentally (p. 18), of later additions—soldiers assigned to the retinue of the Kings, as well as the introduction of an entirely new play, *The Flight into Egypt*. All this, however, without data or accompanying detail. Because of this lack of circumstantial evidence, Michael's inference (p. 17) "*Der Ausgangspunkt des Freiburger Spieles ist ganz deutlich die einfache lateinische Feier mit der dramatischen Verlesung des Evangeliums*"—is not convincing. Even he seems to have felt some doubts, for he adds (p. 19 f) "*Am Epiphanienspiel, vornehmlich an den zwei Dokumenten aus Mailand und Freiburg i. S., versuchten wir zu zeigen, wie Prozessionsspiele aus der liturgischen Feier entsprossen, wie sie aus dem Wort hervorgingen*."

But what is a *Prozessionsspiel*? Michael recognizes that processional elements are present in the medieval church drama from its first beginnings, the "*Quem queritis*" scene. This, however, is not enough (p. 5). "*Der Blickpunkt des Zuschauers zum Schauspielers oder Schauplatz muss durch die Prozession eine entschiedene Veränderung erfahren. Mit andern Worten ein Umziehen nur auf einem und demselben Schauplatz dürfen wir nicht in Betracht ziehen, ebensowenig eine Prozession, die auf dem Raum der Kirche beschränkt bleibt*." This is drawing the lines rather close. Even Michael admits (p. 18, note 6) that the act of the Three Kings in the Lucerne Passion Play has preserved "*eine gewisse, schwache prozessionale Reminiszenz*." In all fairness he might have admitted more. For here the Three Kings in gorgeous array, each with a considerable retinue, including a "strange animal" on which is perched a youth bearing the gift, ride into the *Weinmarkt*, where the play was being given, through three different entrances to the

square Surely "der Blickpunkt des Zuschauers" underwent "eine entschiedene Veränderung" Also the indications of a long journey have been well met While no one would call the Passion Play a *Prozessionsspiel*, this and other scenes or acts might well be classified as processional acts

Indeed, I regard these attempts to classify and place in separate categories the many slightly varying forms of the medieval church drama as unfortunate Even the old division of the *Osterfeiern* into 1 Stufe, 2 Stufe, 3 Stufe has clouded our picture of the development And the terms *Osterspiel* and *Passionsspiel* represent a purely modern differentiation For in 16th century Lucerne the term *Osterspil* was quite as current for the Passion Play as was *Passionsspil* Personally I believe that Perger (see Michael *Verzeichnis*, p 78) was on the right track and that all these plays, which contain processional elements, some more, some less, should be listed under the general term *Bewegungs-drama*

Actually, however, this, the controversial side, plays but a comparatively small part in the monograph For Michael's treatment of the development of these pieces I have nothing but words of praise. Here there is much that will be of very definite value to all students of the medieval drama in Germany Especially the discussion of the *Prophetenspiele*, showing clearly how the dogmatic and epic elements passed over into the Corpus Christi plays, is excellent. This is also the case with his treatment of the so-called *Innsbrucker Frohnlechnamsspiel* with its large influence upon later pieces. Best of all are the two, all too brief, sections which deal with the *Kunzelsau* and *Freiburg i B* Corpus Christi plays. Both of these are a genuine contribution to our knowledge

M BLAKEMORE EVANS

Ohio State University

Goethe und seine Zeit By GEORG LUKÁČZ Bern A Francke
A. G. Verlag [1947]. Pp. 207. sf 12 50

Die sechs Aufsätze, die Professor Lukács in diesem Bande zusammengefasst hat und die, mit Ausnahme des einen über Holderlins *Hyperion*, um Goethe und Schiller kreisen, sind in dem Jahrzehnt zwischen 1930 und 40 entstanden und zum Teil in schwer zu erlangenden Zeitschriften erschienen. Da sie ursprünglich nicht als Ganzes gedacht waren und nicht in zeitlicher Reihenfolge geschrieben sind, muß sich aus ihrem geistigen Zusammenhange der leitende Gesichtspunkt ergeben, der im Vorwort leider nur kurz skizziert ist und aus dem sich erweist, daß Lukács von Hegelscher und Marxscher Philosophie ausgeht. Selbst wenn man dieser

Weltanschauung skeptisch gegenübersteht, so ist damit bei einem so ernsten und fein empfindenden Gelehrten kein Grund zu einer prinzipiellen Ablehnung von vornherein gegeben, denn es versteht sich von selbst, daß wir es hier nicht mit einer jener leichtfertigen Arbeiten zu tun haben, die von den Klassikern verlangt, daß sie Marxisten vor Marx gewesen seien. Man wird im Gegenteil von einem so gescheiterten Mann mit fester historischer Perspektive neuer und unerwarteter Aufschlüsse gewartig sein müssen, selbst wenn man hier und da an gewissen Schlagworten und besonders an der undankbar negativen Einstellung verdienten "bürgerlichen" Gelehrten gegenüber Anstoß nimmt

Lukács wirft im Vorworte sowohl eine abstrakte prinzipielle Ablehnung deutscher Kultur vom Antifaschismus aus sowie einer unsoziologisch-unpolitischen Wertung derselben und betont, daß sich in Deutschland, im Gegensatz zu Frankreich und England, gesellschaftlicher Fortschritt und nationale Einheitsbewegung im Widerstreit zueinander und zuletzt die zweite auf Kosten der ersten zu einem verspäteten tragischen Kapitalismus entwickelt hatten, der, weil in keiner Proportion zur Stärke des Landes, ein Hauptfaktor der beiden Weltkriege gewesen sei. Es sei nunmehr an der Zeit festzustellen, ob in der von einer reaktionären Literaturforschung mißdeuteten klassischen deutschen Literatur nicht progressive Tendenzen zu finden seien, an die eine Bewegung zur Erneuerung Europas anknüpfen könne

Fraglos hat Lukács recht, wenn er den aufklärungsfeindlichen deutschen Literaturforschern vorwirft, daß sie durch die Theorie einer Praromantik die deutsche Humanitätsepoche in einen unversöhnlichen Gegensatz zur Aufklärung und zugleich zu einer chauvinistischen Einstellung zur französischen Literatur (statt nur der hofischen) gedeutet haben, welche mit Hilfe der Legende vom Antihistorismus der Aufklärung (die schon Cassirer bekämpft hat) die Linien von der französischen Geschichtsphilosophie über Herder zu Hegel verwischt. Aber auch Goethe sei immer wieder einerseits in schroffen Gegensatz zu den Ideen der französischen Revolution gestellt statt nur zu deren plebejischen Auswuchsen, andererseits in seinem Realismus, "dem Produkt seiner Auffassung der großen Ereignisse seiner Zeit," verkannt worden

Leider sind die beiden ersten Aufsätze des Buches die am wenigsten überzeugenden. Der *Werther* mit seiner Forderung der Entsprechung von subjektiver Innen- und objektiver Außenwelt, seiner rechtsrevolutionären Nahe zu Justus Moser und endlich seiner Annahme einer physiologischen Bestimmtheit des Menschen (Selbstmordgespräch) ist so voller Widersprüche (die Lukács durchaus anerkennt), daß "eine Weiterführung der Rousseauschen Linie" und Verwandtschaft mit aufklärerischen Idealen sich schließlich auf die Idee der "humanistischen Revolte" beschränken

muß Klarer kann der Verfasser die Gestaltung der "tragischen Krise der burgerlichen Humanitätsideale" und den Beginn "ihres vorläufig utopistischen Hinauswachsens über den Rahmen der burgerlichen Gesellschaft" schon im *Wilhelm Meister* nachweisen, in dem freilich die Aneignung des Wertes einer jeden noch so beschränkten Tätigkeit abhängt von dem schließlich ästhetisch unterbauten Bewußtsein der "idealisierenden Kraft" (Schiller) des Tuenden, mit der er seine Rolle im Ganzen der Gesellschaft erfaßt — Einen Gipfelpunkt erreicht Lukácz' Darstellung des Ringens der beiden großen Dichter um die "Überwindung der gesellschaftlich-inhaltlichen Problematik der burgerlichen Gegenwart mit Hilfe der schöpferisch erneuerten antiken Form" Die Antike — und diese Erkenntnis wird so oft übersehen — ist für sie eben nicht das einzelne schöne Individuum, sondern der allseitig tätige Mensch in seiner sozialen Verbundenheit, wie sie die einmalige Gunst der kleinen griechischen Stadtrepubliken ermöglichte Dies wird besonders in "Schillers Theorie der modernen Literatur" weiter verfolgt, in der neben den "genialen Einblicken Schillers" in den Zusammenhang von Ideal und Wirklichkeit auch die mit seinem überwundenen Kantianismus verbundene Schranke aufgewiesen wird

Die achtzig Seiten umfassenden "Faust-Studien" des Buches sind so reich an neuen Einblicken, so konzentriert in ihrer Interpretation auf Grund der spezifischen Betrachtungsweise des Verfassers, daß ein Eingehen auf Einzelheiten hier unangebracht scheint, selbst wenn ein grundsätzlicher Widerspruch wie bei der Auffassung von der "Sorge" oder von Fausts "Leugnung eines jeden Jenseits" dazu herausfordert Am wertvollsten scheint mir hier das Herausarbeiten der Doppelheit der Handlung "Gestaltet wird das Schicksal eines Menschen, und doch ist der Inhalt des Gedichts das Geschick der ganzen Menschheit" Aber auch die Charakterisierung der Einzelgestaltung der Szenen sowie der dramatisch-episch-lyrischen Form des Ganzen, der Dialektik und des Lakonismus der Goethischen Poesie ist oft hervorragend glücklich charakterisiert

Das verhältnißmäßig schlanke Buch gehört auf die Leseliste eines jeden Germanisten Es bietet keine leichte Lektüre, will in wiederholtem Lesen erarbeitet werden und wird noch lange Zeit Stoff zu Auseinandersetzungen liefern

Zu bedauern ist, daß, wie bei so vielen deutschen Büchern, ein Index fehlt, scharf zu verurteilen, daß bei allen Zitaten auch die Quellenangabe fehlt, eine Rücksichtslosigkeit gegen den nachprüfenden Leser und den interessierten Forscher

ERNST FEISE

Shelley's Major Poetry The Fabric of a Vision By CARLOS
BAKER Princeton, N. J. Princeton University Press, 1948.
307 pp \$5 00

Professor Baker has given us an eminently readable and well-informed book on Shelley. Its clear organization, leisurely development, and simple but often eloquent style do full justice to the subject, which is presented with unflagging earnestness and enthusiasm. Particularly gratifying is the author's general attitude towards Shelley, whom he regards as a poetical phenomenon very much worth understanding, and whom he wastes no time at all either in defending or in censuring.

It is Professor Baker's opinion that only through an orderly, connected study of the major poems can Shelley be properly understood. He therefore proposes to consider each poem as Shelley wrote it, examining its origin, purposes, literary and philosophical antecedents, and its connection with Shelley's other works. Professor Baker emphasizes the complexity of Shelley as poet, philosopher, psychologist, idealist, and reformer, and rightfully insists that from beginning to end Shelley was fundamentally a thinker who strove unremittingly to reach a unified and satisfying view of life. Beginning with the irreconcilable rationalism and idealism of *Queen Mab*, step by step through *Alastor*, *The Revolt of Islam*, *Prometheus Unbound*, and the darker studies of life in *The Cenci*, *The Masque of Anarchy*, and other less important poems, Shelley at length reached, Professor Baker thinks, a fully unified concept of existence in *Epipsychidion*, *Adonais*, and *The Triumph of Life*. The final view, which reconciled permanence and change, and (to some extent) good and evil, was not the happy and confident view of the early Shelley. The ideal of truth, love, and beauty was as glorious as ever, in fact, far more vast and real. But this was the spiritual world, the world of thought, the faith in man's ability to throw off his chains and to share in the eternal was greatly diminished—life did truly triumph over man. There is, however, no cessation of effort in Shelley to make the ideal prevail, for him and the select few no other course of action was possible.

The discussions of the individual poems are always illuminating and persuasive. The book has the singular quality of improving almost constantly, partly because Shelley's poetry improved. This is not altogether the case, however, for the analysis of some of the minor poems is even better than the discussion of some of the great poems. Indeed, one of the genuine contributions of the book is the excellent exposition of *The Masque of Anarchy*, *Peter Bell the Third*, and *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Especially notable also are the very numerous associations of Shelley's poems with his reading, and the literary sources of passages and concepts in Milton, Spenser, Dante, Virgil, Ovid, Aeschylus, and others.

No expositor of Shelley can expect to win complete approval of his interpretations. Though in most fundamental matters Professor Baker will carry his readers with him, he will meet with decided opposition on some particulars. I, for example, consider his view of the maniac in *Julian and Maddalo* questionable, and I regard as altogether wrong his opinion, most ingeniously presented, that *Epipsychidion* is wholly ideal and in no way autobiographical. The very fact that the poem was addressed to Emilia Viviani disproves this. If the poem were altogether ideal and without direct biographical significance, Shelley would not have addressed any particular woman, knowing that to do so was to wound Mary, as the poem certainly did.

For avoiding controversy and concentrating mainly on his own analysis of the poems, Professor Baker must be most heartily commended. Anyone who has a reasonably sound acquaintance with Shelley must, however, be constantly aware that there are various other interpretations of the poems as a whole or in part which find no place in his book. One would have felt more secure about Professor Baker's having given these interpretations some consideration if to each poem he had added a bibliographical note listing these articles and books which he did not choose specifically to bring into his discussion. As a history of the development of Shelley's thought, Professor Baker's book is perhaps weakest in its neglect of Shelley's intimate acquaintance with the philosophers,—Locke, Hume, Berkeley, Spinoza, Plato. In fact, after *Queen Mab* one would think that Shelley forgot philosophic theory and that he thought with almost complete independence. Throughout his life one of the most important problems for Shelley was the origin and validity of knowledge. Here, too, might be mentioned an error (p. 256 n) which Professor Baker must have drawn from Dowden's *Life of Shelley* (II, 413), namely, that Shelley planned to write a poem called *The Creator*. No such poem was ever projected by Shelley. Dowden's error was based on a misinterpretation of a passage in one of Shelley's letters, which appeared to be confirmed by Mary Shelley's letter of June 30, 1821, to Mrs. Gisborne. As printed in *Shelley and Mary* (Dowden's source) Mary's letter reads "‘The Creator’ has not yet made himself heard." The original letter (in the Bodleian Library) reads "The cicala has not yet made himself heard."

After all disagreements have been aired, the predominant feeling of Shelley students and scholars will be one of gratitude to Professor Baker for a good book, beautifully written and full of original observation and thought.

FREDERICK L. JONES

University of Pennsylvania

La concorde des deux langages Par JEAN LEMAIRE DE BELGES
Edition critique publiée par JEAN FRAPPIER Paris Librairie
Droz, 1947. Pp lxxviii + 112

Les épîtres de l'amant vert Par JEAN LEMAIRE DE BELGES Edition
critique publiée par JEAN FRAPPIER Lille-Genève Giard-Droz,
1948 Pp xlix + 102

M le Professeur Jean Frappier, dont l'*Etude sur la mort le roi Artu* a été vivement admirée, vient d'éditer trois ouvrages de Jean Le Maire de Belges qui sont particulièrement remarquables. Il semble qu'on ait été souvent tenté de négliger les œuvres poétiques de notre 'rhétoriqueur,'¹ au profit de sa grande composition en prose, les *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularités de Troie*. On a dit que, parfois, sa prose poétique était 'supérieure à sa poésie,' et on est allé jusqu'à prétendre que Jean Lemaire était un 'médiocre poète'. Ce qui le distingue, pourtant, c'est bien la qualité *poétique* et littéraire de ses œuvres. Celles que nous présente M. Frappier nous permettent de goûter l'art gracieux et aimable de celui qu'on a appelé le premier poète humaniste français.

L'édition complète de ses œuvres est, en général, assez mauvaise. M. Frappier nous donne un texte qui a été établi avec beaucoup de soin, et il nous en offre les leçons les plus satisfaisantes.² Il nous a fait connaître les événements de la vie de Jean Lemaire et les conditions dans lesquelles celui-ci composa ses poèmes. Il nous paraît utile d'insister sur les relations de la famille de Bourbon³ et de Jean Lemaire. Philibert le Beau mourut en septembre 1504, et, dans la première épître de l'amant vert (c'était un perroquet), composée au printemps de 1505, Jean Lemaire fait allusion au deuil récent de Marguerite. Je crois qu'on a tendance à exagérer la mélancolie de cette princesse et son désespoir à la mort de son second mari. On sait que le thème de la tristesse amoureuse est traditionnel, et il nous paraît dangereux d'attribuer à Marguerite des sentiments dont l'expression poétique est toute conventionnelle. Je crois aussi que Marguerite n'adopta la devise *Fortune infortunée fort une* qu'en 1506, après la mort de son frère, Philippe le Beau. Bruchet⁴ a montré que cette devise apparaît en 1509 lors de la publication, par Jean Lemaire, des *Regretz de la dame infortunée sur le trespas de son tres cher frère unique*. Je l'ai relevée dans un

¹ Cf. W. L. Wiley, 'Who named them *Rhétoriqueurs*?' *Mediaeval Studies in honor of J. D. M. Ford* (Cambridge, 1948), pp. 335-352.

² Par exemple, *croissant* (v. 154 de la *Concorde*) au lieu de *croissant* que nous lisons dans une édition qui se trouve à la *Houghton Library*. 'On les vend à Paris en la rue saint Jacques a l'enseigne du pellican devant saint Yves.' M. Frappier en conclut que le Temple de Vénus est gothique.

³ Abbé Armand Macé, *Une merveille de l'art gothique. La chapelle des Bourbons à la Cathédrale St Jean de Lyon* (Lyon, 1941).

⁴ *Marguerite d'Autriche* (Lille, 1927), p. 175.

manuscrit de Michel Riz, écrit probablement dans les derniers mois de 1506

M Frappier a excellemment dit le charme de ces épîtres de l'amant vert, et il indique l'allusion qu'a faite Jean Lemaire au *Culex* attribué à Virgile Il me paraît intéressant de la relever à mon tour⁵ Quant à la *Concorde*, M Frappier pense qu'elle a été 'composée très probablement, et en tout cas au plus tard, en 1511 .', car c'est la date que porte le ms. qu'il utilise Il me semble qu'il faudrait savoir si 1511 se rapporte au nouveau ou à l'ancien style Et puis, je crois devoir remarquer que Jean Lemaire se vante, dans la *Concorde*, d'avoir été le premier à employer la *terza rima* en français Comme il s'était déjà servi du *tercet* en 1503, dans le *Temple d'Honneur*, j'avoue que j'incline à croire que la traduction de l'*Idylle des Roses*, le poème *Nostre Age*, quelques parties du *Temple d'Honneur* et de la *Concorde des deux langages* ont été composés à peu près à la même époque⁶ Je pense que Jean Lemaire a remanié ses poèmes au moment de les imprimer, ce qui explique la mention de Molinet, dans la *Concorde*, comme d'un poète qui est mort

Notons que le terme de *poésie* que M Frappier relève (p xlii, n 2) dans la *Concorde* se trouve aussi dans la deuxième épître de l'amant vert (v 448), et puis-je me permettre de faire quelques réserves sur ce que dit M Frappier au sujet de '*l'alliance de la poésie et de la musique*' (p xxxix) On sait que Jean de Garlande faisait 'ressortir la versification à la musique, non à la rhétorique'⁷ et que Deschamps, comme Molinet, avait des opinions semblables. mais il s'agit, croyons-nous, plutôt d'une question de classification que d'opinion sur la nature de la poésie Disons enfin que M Frappier place le Temple de Vénus sur la colline de Fourvière, tandis que je localise ce temple au confluent du Rhône et de la Saône,⁸ et terminons en exprimant toute notre admiration pour les savantes éditions de M. Frappier.⁹ Si celui-ci a pu interpréter

⁵ Cf 'Un motif de la poésie amoureuse au XVI^e siècle,' *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 307-336 — A Taylor, *The literary riddle before 1600* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948)

⁶ 'Jean Lemaire et Ausone,' *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 594-600

⁷ E Langlois, *Recueil d'arts de seconde rhétorique* (Paris, 1902), p 111

⁸ 'Jean de Meun et les origines du naturalisme de la Renaissance,' *PMLA*, LIX (1944), 624-645 M Frappier remarque bien (p liv) que le *Génus* de la *Concorde* est 'un primat des Gaules', mais il n'admet pas l'assimilation que nous avons faite entre le *Temple* et l'Eglise St Jean, ou l'archevêque de Lyon officie, les jours de fête Rappelons que l'archevêque Charles de Bourbon avait voulu se faire construire une chapelle attenante à la Cathédrale, et que son frère Pierre avait signé un contrat avec l'archevêque François de Rohan, dont le père était duc de Nemours M Frappier croit que le mot *Nemours* qui se lit dans la *Concorde* n'est employé que parce qu'il appartenait à un proverbe Nous continuons à voir là une allusion possible à la famille des Nemours

⁹ Disons aussi que nous sommes heureux de voir M Frappier remarquer (p xxiii) que les raffinements de l'art des rhétoriciens 'ne sont pas sans

avec sympathie et compréhension les œuvres de Jean Lemaire, n'est-ce point dû, non seulement au mérite éminent du commentateur, mais aussi au fait que des compositions du début du XVI^e siècle sont présentées par un médiéviste?

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

Tragédie cornélienne, Tragédie racinienne By GEORGES MAY
Urbana University of Illinois Press, 1948 Pp 255 \$2 50

Certainly a superior dissertation, well written, thoughtful, and of interest to others as well as to specialists Dr May knows his two authors thoroughly and has a good command of his bibliography I am glad to add that, like a true Frenchman, he discusses Corneille and Racine without once mentioning the baroque or other "bijoux d'Allemagne," as Collé would have called them His chief contention is that Corneille selects unusual subjects and constantly seeks to surprise the spectators, while Racine chooses familiar subjects, making known almost from the start how things are going to turn out, and is consequently better able to inspire pity and awe than is Corneille with his melodramatic devices

In seeking, however, to add something new to a long discussed subject, he carries his comparison too far It is hard to make us believe that the subjects of *Médée*, *Horace*, *Œdipe*, and *Sophonisbe* were less well known to a seventeenth-century audience than were those of the *Frères Ennemis*, *Andromaque*, *Iphigénie*, or *Phèdre* Seeing this difficulty, Dr. May seeks to find other than esthetic reasons for Corneille's selection of his more familiar subjects He proposes, for instance, that *Pompée* was written to condemn Richelieu's cruelty and to make a humane minister out of Mazarin But he forgets that Mazarin was Richelieu's man and that it would have been dangerous to attack the recently deceased cardinal in a play dedicated to his successor. Chaulmer, moreover, had dramatized the same theme and had dedicated his tragedy to Richelieu himself Surely he did not believe that anyone would accuse him of putting the cardinal on the stage in the disguise of an Egyptian politician Dr May writes (p 41)

Qu'est-ce que cette "mauvaise politique" dont Mazarin est capable de venger "pleinement" grâce à "la justice qu'[il] fait rendre par tout le royaume," sinon celle de Richelieu?

analogie avec le gothique flamboyant et les constructions polyphoniques des musiciens contemporains Et cela nous rappelle ce qu'a dit Ed Dolléans, rendant compte d'un livre de L. Febvre 'il convient de montrer que les éléments divers qui constituèrent une société forment un tout' (*Critique*, iv [1948], 236 242) Aujourd'hui où l'on prône la méthode a-historique, il est réconfortant de lire des critiques qui tiennent compte de l'histoire et des relations inter-dépendantes des diverses formes de l'activité humaine

Abridged in this way, Corneille's appeal to Mazarin may seem to support Dr May's argument, but let Corneille speak for himself. He writes that Pompey relies upon

la générosité de Votre Eminence qu'elle ne dédaignera pas de lui conserver cette seconde vie que j'ai tâché de lui redonner, et que lui rendant cette justice qu'elle fait rendre par tout le royaume, elle le vengera pleinement de la mauvaise politique de la cour d'Egypte

Obviously Corneille is hoping that *Pompée*, the play, will have, with Mazarin's support, the success in France that Pompey, the man, vainly sought at the Egyptian court. There is no reason to read political significance into this dedicatory blurb.

Again, eager to emphasize the element of surprise in Corneille, Dr May (p. 89) declares that "jusqu'à l'avant-dernière scène du V^{ème} acte [du *Cid*], Chimène, et avec elle tout le public, doit penser que Rodrigue a été tué par Don Sanche." One would hardly guess that the "avant-dernière scène" is the one immediately following that in which Don Sanche appears before Chimène with Rodrigue's sword. Moreover, as the *Cid* was called a tragi-comedy when it was first acted, no one at all familiar with the theater could have supposed for a moment that the hero had been killed. Nor, if the rôle of Don Sanche was properly acted, would any spectator except the most naïve suppose that he had conquered Rodrigue. Corneille was not trying to deceive his audience in order subsequently to surprise it. He was seeking to get from Chimène a public admission of her love, one that she would not have made if she had known that Rodrigue was alive, and he was presenting the report of the second duel in the play differently from the way in which he had made known the outcome of the first.

On the other hand, Dr May exaggerates Racine's indifference to surprise. He admits that his theory is not illustrated by *Mithridate*, but he insists that the outcome of *Iphigénie* is foreseen early in the tragedy. Yet the oracle had clearly said, "Sacrifiez Iphigénie." How was the audience to know that Eriphile, as well as her cousin, had been named Iphigénie? It would certainly require much more acumen to guess how Racine's play would end than to understand that Don Sanche had not killed Rodrigue.

As a matter of fact, Corneille and Racine agreed with d'Aubignac that events in a play should be "préparés," but not "prévus." They both understood their audiences better than Diderot did when he urged revelation from the start. Corneille does select, on the whole, less familiar subjects than Racine and makes greater use of surprise, but the two dramatists belonged too much to the same school for us to accept the sweeping distinctions that Dr May would have us make between them.¹

¹ There are a few slips that need correction. P. 29, Corneille's remarks about *Pulchérie* are misunderstood. He is not admitting defeat, but is claiming that, though it was played at the unpopular Marais theater and its characters were "contre le goût du temps," it drew crowds and made

If, however, Dr May has sought to fit Racine too tightly into one mould and Corneille into another that seems less admirable, he makes amends in his conclusion (p 235), which I quote to do justice to his sense of fairness

Si le debut du XX^{eme} siècle a assisté à un prodigieux regain de faveur pour Racine, le pessimisme et le fatalisme contemporains n'y sont pas étrangers, pas plus que les déceptions amenées par la guerre de 1914-1918 Et le retour à Corneille auquel nous pouvons assister de nos jours n'est certes pas sans rapports avec le besoin instinctif de chercher quelque part l'enseignement du courage et de la grandeur d'âme

H CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Wordsworth's View of Nature By NORMAN LACEY Cambridge at the University Press [New York The Macmillan Company], 1948 Pp viii + 128 \$2 00

The purpose of this brief study, Mr Lacey writes, is to present in a new light a part of the facts known about Wordsworth The new light which the author turns upon the facts is a point of view intended to reveal what is "right" and what is "mistaken" in the poet's search for truth and happiness In the concluding lines of *The Prelude*, Wordsworth says that he and Coleridge, prophets of nature, are going to instruct mankind in a new gospel But today, says Mr Lacey, Wordsworth's vision of a "happy company of imaginative freemen seems as far off as ever" He himself never attained this imaginative freedom" (p 54)

The reasons for his failure are two (1) He sought to pattern his attitudes too much after Dorothy's (pp 117, 57) He entertained the mistaken belief that her relationship to nature and life was the perfect one and that he ought to attune himself to it (pp 56-7) He could not become like his sister, however, because the reflective had forever supplanted in him the unconscious and immediate (2) Wordsworth did not sufficiently value his mystic

a reputation for the actors Pp 37-8, the authenticity of the poems attributed to Corneille by Marty-Laveaux is far from being established P 47, the year when Mairet's *Sophonisbe* was first played is 1634, not 1629 P 119, I wrote, "encouraged," not "encourages" P 119, Créon predicts his death, but it is by no means sure that he dies before the play is over P 125, read Prospero Bonarelli P 128, the lost *Iphigénie* of La Clèrièrè must be his *Oreste et Pylade*, which in all probability is derived from *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* and consequently should not be mentioned here Pp 137-8, it is argued that Quesnel's reference to "portraits" supports Charlier's theory that Racine was portraying in *Athalie* the "souverains anglais," but what character in the play is a portrait of James II? And can Joas be a portrait of the Pretender, who was little more than two years old when *Athalie* was completed? P 167, I would not put Thérémène among the characterless confidants P 216, in quoting d'Aubignac's remark about *Sertorius*, Dr May should have mentioned how violently prejudiced the abbé was at the time

experiences When time dulled the edge of his joys in sense, he refused to look beyond them to a fuller life of the imagination, he chose to cling to them and even to their ghosts More and more he put his trust in spots of time, buried "ten years deep" or even further back in childhood, and their power to lift him up when fallen was not unlimited" (p 67). He might have gone forward by following a path that lay open before him—the mystic experience, which could have led him to the world of spirit It is "surprising that he did not realize clearly that he was most certainly in possession of the truth when he was 'laid asleep in body' . In those moments, I venture to suggest, he was in touch with the Creator of man and of nature If Wordsworth could have thought only of the Giver of [these experiences], he might have come within sight of that destiny to which in an earlier mystical experience he had been dedicated" (pp 64-5). Mr Lacey does not mean that Wordsworth should have sought further mystic experiences, but that he should have tried to understand them "There is a way forward to a new spontaneity, to what Kierkegaard called 'immediacy after reflection'" (p 116)

Mr. Lacey's reading of the poems is thoughtful and often illuminating, yet it is unlikely that his major conclusions (summarized above) will find wide acceptance In a succession of poems beginning with "Tintern Abbey" Wordsworth faces the fact of permanent loss, and if he clings to the past, it is not to retrieve his lost spontaneity but to compensate for it by building upon proven resources All the evidence upon the mystic experiences indicates that he considered them "things divine" (*Prelude*, VIII, 559) It is purely speculative to suggest that through any given process, Kierkegaardian or otherwise, he might have gone beyond them to "imaginative freedom" and serenity

This book would be more useful to students if Mr Lacey had indicated, by frequent reference, wherein his argument departs from other scholarly opinion One would wish, for example, that he had shown to what extent he finds his views in harmony with those of Professor Beach, who devoted to Wordsworth some one hundred seventy-five pages of his excellent study of *The Concept of Nature in Nineteenth-Century English Poetry* It is difficult to understand Mr Lacey's opinion that Wordsworth's great contribution to thought was his belief that the universe is animated by a living spirit (p 115), in view of Professor Beach's demonstration of the prevalence of that idea during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries He makes no reference to Professor Beatty in his discussion of associationism or of Professor Havens in his comments on nature and on the mystic experiences He counts only two such experiences in *The Prelude*, Professor Havens, three (that is, of the particular kind that Mr Lacey specifies) Such omissions—and they are not infrequent—tend to raise questions about the orientation of the book, in part and as a whole.

JOHN QUINCY WOLF, JR

Pérez Galdós, Spanish Liberal Crusader By H CHONON BERKOWITZ
 Madison University of Wisconsin Press, 1948 Pp.
 xi + 499. \$6 00

Here are five hundred pages of grist for many a lecture on Spain's great literary figure, Benito Pérez Galdós. Teachers who wish to make the author come alive before the eyes of their students will find a wealth of material in Professor Berkowitz' book. Especially interesting are the opening chapters on the early life of Galdós in Las Palmas. There are the originals of Doña Perfecta and daughter Rosario in the figures of the novelist's own mother and childhood sweetheart. There, too, are the small-town prejudice and lack of tolerance against which Don Benito launched his famous trilogy of novels. To collect material for his book Professor Berkowitz travelled to the Canary Islands, interviewed members of the Galdós family and friends there, as well as in Spain. He must also have gone through many old newspaper files as well as all the magazines and periodicals contemporary to Galdós. Here the reader will find the circumstances leading up to the publication of each novel and how it was received by public and critic alike. Also, all the alternate successes and failures attendant upon Don Benito's early efforts as a dramatist are suspensefully related.

Although this purports to be a popular style biography of Galdós, yet there is one important omission. Much is hinted but little is told of the Spanish author's sex life. Dr Berkowitz manages to give the impression that he knows a good deal more than his sources in Spain would consent to let him tell. We do learn from the book that Galdós was constantly in need of funds because his indulgences were so expensive. Need for money accounts for much of the author's prolific production, the third series of the *Episodios Nacionales*, for instance, never would have been written had not their creator been in serious financial straits.

The book gives a sane and objective picture of Galdós in politics. A member of the Chamber of Deputies upon two occasions, the Spanish author was too shy to make a speech. He was content to attend sessions and observe. His literary works, especially the *Episodios*, spoke much more persuasively in favor of the cause of Spanish liberalism. Don Benito's political influence probably reached its greatest point in 1901 when the immensely popular anticlerical play, *Electra*, was staged. Professor Berkowitz makes us share the excitement of that great event. It is a high point in the biography, just as it was a climax in the life of Galdós, marking as it did his complete success as a dramatist, when so many critics had maintained that he could not hope to succeed in both drama and novel.

Berkowitz does not see fit to analyze the content of any of Galdós' many titles. He politely assumes that we have read each book, while at the same time he carefully translates into English all quotations and Spanish phrases.¹ The book does, however, make

sense even to one who has not read many of Don Benito's works. The critical reactions cited necessitate the author's giving a fair idea of the theme and treatment of each literary production. Students, on the other hand, can be given the book as a source for term papers without worry on the professor's part but that they will actually have to read the Galdósian titles assigned. Professor Berkowitz has given us a supplement, not a short cut to knowledge. It is a supplement which should be read by everyone seriously interested in the development of the modern novel and drama in Spain.

DONALD F. BROWN

The Johns Hopkins University

BRIEF MENTION

Walt Whitman and the Authorship of The Good Gray Poet. By NATHAN RESNICK. Brooklyn: Long Island University Press, 1948. 38 pp. \$1.75. Mr. Nathan Resnick's thesis is that Whitman himself wrote *The Good Gray Poet*. The proof, he admits, is largely circumstantial and subjective, but he finds corroboration in the fact that Whitman appeared to accept his dismissal by Secretary Harlan without public protest (unusual conduct for him), in similarities between Whitman's style and that of the pamphlet supposedly written by O'Connor, and in Whitman's habit of ghost-writing his own biography under the names of Burroughs, Bucke, and in anonymous articles. The reviewer is not entirely convinced by the stylistic tests. But the possibility of Whitman's having written *The Good Gray Poet* cannot be denied. This idiosyncrasy is well known. Mr. Resnick is not attempting "to violate the sacred image of America's greatest poet," only "to clarify and enlarge" biographical truth.

GAY WILSON ALLEN

New York University

Les Chansons Élizabéthaines. By FLORIS DELATTRE and CAMILLE CHEMIN. Paris: Didier, 1948. Pp. 459. This book which consists of an essay by Delattre and translations by Chemin is an excellent example of French taste and literary penetration. In scope it begins with the ballads and ends with the lyrics of the later Jacobean dramatists; it also contains an appended bibliography on Elizabethan music. Delattre writes with scholarship in the back of his head but with a pen that is both decisive and charming. Chemin's translations are free and exact, nonetheless, they are highly poetic. Intended as it is for the French public, this book is likewise a lesson for Englishmen and Americans who have attempted the same type of work and have usually come off so badly.

D. C. A.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN AMBASSADOR *Time*,¹ reporting the arrival of a foreign diplomat in Washington, says "General Kaiser repeated the 17th Century aphorism* (*ftn attributed to Sir H Wotton) about an ambassador being an honest man sent abroad to lie for his country" Sir Henry was not quite so blunt as this, the unequivocal meaning is cloaked in decent Latin, and the English version shows an urbanity more in keeping with his reputation Walton's anecdote² gives the more subtle version "Sir Henry Wotton took an occasion to write a pleasant definition of an Ambassador in these very words 'Legatus est vir bonus, peregre missus ad mentiendum Reipublicae causa' Which Sir Henry could have been content should have been thus Englished 'An Ambassador is an honest man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country'" The *NED* gives substantially the English version of Walton's *lie abroad* 'to lodge out of one's house or abode, to reside in a foreign country'

J R HENDRICKSON

Temple University

CATULLUS A LA WILDER In his foreword to *The Ides of March*, Thornton Wilder tells us that all documents are from his imagination except the poems of Catullus and a passage from Suetonius In the quotation on p 67, evidently intended to be Carmen V, 4-6, he also seems to have drawn largely on his imagination, or an unusually hazy memory, for only the first of the three lines is quoted correctly In the second, the verb *occidit* has not only been taken from its proper position, but shifted to the passive, the resulting *occisus est* indicates a confusion between *occidere* and *occidēre*, and introduces the additional blunder of making *lux* masculine In the third line a superfluous *et* has been inserted Needless to say, these changes have wrecked the meter of both lines It also seems somewhat incongruous that on p 135 he should depict Caesar exulting over the emancipation of Roman letters from Greek on the basis of Carmen LI, which is a translation, however brilliant and free, of Sappho's *φαίρεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν*.

J R HENDRICKSON

*Temple University*¹ *Time*, March 1, 1948, p 14² Izaak Walton, *The Lives of Dr John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr Richard Hooker, Mr George Herbert* (Reprinted by J. M Dent, London, 1898), I, 165.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

MAY, 1949

Number 5

POE'S 'TO HELEN'

The following study has a divided aim. My principal interest is in its possible addition of one more example of those poems, like Rossetti's 'The Stream's Secret,' in which two women have sat for a kind of composite portrait, or at least in which the poet has for his artistic ends written ostensibly about one woman and mixed his colors partly from his imagination (as one would expect) and partly from the memory of another woman. Painters are known to have used more than one model for a picture, it is not so commonly understood that a poet may do the same. The Poe interest, however, is rather different. Here we have if not a contribution to ignorance, still a re-emphasis of uncertainty. For Poe has not been well served by his biographers, the record is crisscrossed with inaccuracy, sentimentalizing admirers, romanticizing partizans, and too eager amateurs have confused the drawing, even the careful efforts of Professor Quinn have not removed all the difficulties.

The stanzas now familiar under the title of 'To Helen' are regularly said to have been inspired by Mrs Jane Stith Stanard, the mother of Poe's school friend, Robert Craig Stanard. The principal evidence for this belief is in Poe's letter to Mrs Whitman: "and then the lines I had written, in my passionate boyhood to the first, purely ideal love of my soul—Helen Stannard of whom I told you."¹ Now poets are not always trustworthy witnesses

¹ *The Last Letters of Edgar Allan Poe to Sarah Helen Whitman*, ed James A Harrison, New York, 1909, pp 9 f. This is really Poe's first letter to Mrs Whitman, and is so indicated, p 5. It is dated "Fordham, Sunday night, Oct 1, 1848." In the Virginia Edition, *Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed James A Harrison, New York, [1902], xvii, 292 ff, where part of the letter is printed, it is said to be "Undated"—A little earlier

about their own works, one would hardly think of Poe as an exception, and yet Poe's statement about Mrs Stanard and 'To Helen' has been accepted, with an occasional reservation concerning the date, by all Poe students

Opinion is divided as to how well Poe knew Mrs Stanard Woodberry says bluntly "He saw this lady . . . but once She died April 28, 1924"² But in his note (I, 364) he adds Mrs Clemm's testimony that Poe saw her often Hervey Allen is very positive on this point " . . . it is idle to say that Poe met 'Helen' only once"³ The evidence itself is confused On 10 March 1859 Mrs Whitman wrote to Mrs Clemm "Edgar told me once about going to her house with Robert She was very kind to Edgar and when she died suddenly, a few weeks after, he felt such sorrow for her death (as he told me) that he used to go every night to the cemetery where she was buried, He told me much that was *very interesting* about his Sorrow on her death, though he had only *once* seen her"⁴ This is Poe's account remembered by Mrs Whitman ten years after his last letter to her, and it is plain from other letters that Mrs Whitman knew nothing about Mrs Stanard except what she heard from Edgar Nor was Mrs Clemm always a sound witness, for 17 April 1859 Mrs Whitman wrote to her "What

Poe had written to Mrs Shew "I place you in *my esteem*—in all solemnity—beside the friend of my boyhood—the mother of my schoolfellow, of whom I told you, and as I have repeated in the poem as the truest, tenderest of this world's most womanly souls, and an angel to my forlorn and darkened nature" (Virginia Edition, xvii, 300) This letter is dated "[June, 1848]", the omission was probably made by Ingram, from whom Harrison and Woodberry (II, 261-264) take it Hervey Allen (*Israfil*, New York, 1926, II, 751) adds silently, in round brackets, "*To Helen*" after "poem," but retains the suspension points, in the revised edition, 1934, p 599, the round brackets are changed to square There seems to be little doubt however that the poem *was* 'To Helen' and the lady Mrs Stanard, but one still wonders why the omission was ever made—The phrase describing Poe's love for her reappears in Mary E Phillips, *Edgar Allan Poe the Man*, Chicago, 1926, I, 202, as "the 'one idolatrous and purely *ideal love*' of his life"

² George E Woodberry, *The Life of Edgar Allan Poe*, Boston, 1909, I, 29

³ *Israfil*, I, 108 Cf also p 107 "That there were many visits to her house during the course of several years, and not one only, as has been so often stated, is certain" For Allen's 'sources' cf. pp 106 ff

⁴ *Edgar Allan Poe Letters and Documents in the Enoch Pratt Free Library*, ed Arthur Quinn and Richard H Hart, New York, 1941, p 42, also Virginia Edition, xvii, 422

you tell me of Mrs Stannard perplexes me—If she died only 26 years ago, Edgar . would have been 22 years old—Yet I *so well remember* that he described to me his sorrow at hearing of her death while in *school*, & told me of his solitary visits to the cemetery”⁵ As I see it, if Mrs Stanard had died twenty-six years before 1859, Poe would have been at the time of her death twenty-four years old But actually Mrs Stanard had been dead thirty-five years in 1859, and actually Poe was fifteen years old at the time of her death⁶ But if, as Woodberry says,⁷ “The last two years of her life Mrs Stanard led secluded in her family,” then the *once* Poe would have been likely to see her must have been in his thirteenth year Perhaps a compromise position, harmonizing the apparently conflicting evidence, is to be found in Mrs Clemm’s reply, 14 April 1859 “When Eddie was unhappy at home (which was often the case), he went to her for sympathy, and she always consoled and comforted him,—you are mistaken when you say that you believe he saw her but once in her home. He visited there for years, he only saw her once while she was ill . Robert has often told me, of his, and Eddie’s visits to her grave”⁸ This point is perhaps a small one, but it illustrates the uncertainty of our knowledge

It is usually assumed that the poem was composed at about this time, 1824, and later revised—for such accomplished verses as the first published text shows would be very unusual from so young a poet And such may actually have been the case Poe may have drafted or written a ‘To Helen’ in 1824, a text now lost, which more or less closely resembled the text of 1831, *or* on the basis of

⁵ *Letters and Documents*, p 46, Virginia Edition, xvii, 427 f

⁶ The editors of *Letters and Documents* tell us (p 45) “In 1859 Mrs Stanard had been dead for thirty-five years In 1824 Poe was a boy of fourteen” This is arithmetically puzzling, for according to the usual reckoning Poe became fifteen years of age in January 1824 He was fourteen between 19 January 1823 and 18 January 1824 Hervey Allen, having told us that Poe visited her house “during the course of several years” (I, 107), confuses us by concluding in a footnote (n 154, I, 109, revised ed, p 190) “Hence Poe was about fifteen when he first saw ‘Helen,’ ” He was of course fifteen and a little more than three months old *when she died*

⁷ I, 364; no authority cited

⁸ *Letters and Documents*, p 41, from the Lilly Collection

his memory of Mrs Stanaid he may have composed 'To Helen' at some undetermined time between 1824 and 1830 Professor Campbell (following orthodox arithmetic) says "The poem was written, so Lowell states in his sketch of Poe,—and this sketch passed through Poe's hands before going to press (see Woodberry, II, p 103),⁹—when the poet was only fourteen years old, or about a year before Mrs Stanard's death" But he adds "This account, however, is hardly to be credited"¹⁰ Nevertheless it must be observed that apart from the unproved inference that Poe gave his tacit approval to Lowell's statement (though it is true of course that Poe could later have denied or corrected Lowell's statement), there is no evidence that Poe wrote 'To Helen' at the age of fourteen, such testimony as we have directly from him—"in my passionate boyhood", "earliest boyhood"—is very general indeed and in view both of the tone of his letter to Mrs Whitman and of his recognized self-romanticizing is hardly to be taken as a deposition

Certainly, there was no 'To Helen' in the 'Tamberlane' volume of 1827, nor in the 1829 volume. It appeared first in the *Poems*, "Second Edition," 1831, which contained also the lines

I could not love except where Death
Was mingling his with Beauty's breath,—
Or Hymen, Time, and Destiny
Were stalking between her and me

By this date Death and Destiny had robbed him of his foster-mother, Mrs Frances Allan, who died 28 February 1829, and it has been conjectured¹¹ that Mrs Allan contributed something to this poem In truth, the circumstances are quite as favorable for this conjecture as for Poe's own statement, though it must be

⁹ What Woodberry says is that Poe took a month to acknowledge the receipt of Lowell's "biography" With what care Poe read it—deponent saith not

¹⁰ *The Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed Killis Campbell, [1917], p 199 So also A H Quinn, *Edgar Allan Poe, A Critical Biography*, New York, 1941, pp 177-178 "That he wrote the poem as he claimed [Preface to the 1845 volume], in his 'earliest boyhood' seems incredible"

¹¹ By Whitty, quoted in Miss Phillips' *Poe the Man*, I, 326 f, see n 1 above So also Hervey-Allen (I, 308) "'Helen' is probably a combination and imaginative synthesis of Jane Stith Stanard and Frances Allan with the abstract longing for the perfect Belovéd common to all young men"

readily admitted that there is little supporting evidence¹² Poe's silence, it must also be admitted, is not without weight, but Poe had remained 'silent' on the inspiration of the poem for a considerable period, i e., from its composition in 1824 (?) or its publication in 1831 until his romantic and purposeful letter in 1848 to Mrs Whitman

There are thus three figures in the background which are to be fused somehow into a lyrical composite. The first, one may suppose, was Mrs Stanard, the moving cause which started the first impulse to write. So we must recapture for a moment the impression she made on the sensitive and often unhappy boy; she was beautiful enough in his eyes to make him think of Homer's Helen—the "Helen of a thousand dreams" (though that phrase came much later)—and to inspire that "first, purely ideal love." Soon after he fell really in love with Sarah Royster, and the rest is another story.

The 'meaning' of the poem is not altogether clear, for rather divergent interpretations have been read into it. And since it cannot be unreservedly accepted that what Poe published in 1831 was really the poem "written . . . to Helen Stannard", and since it is not unlikely that some feeling for his foster-mother entered into the composition, we are not entitled to press any of the details of the 1831 text to fit Mrs Stanard. Yet all the editors and commentators have done so¹³. The first two stanzas signify that Mrs Stanard's

¹² Hervey Allen (*Israfel*, I, 128, 1934, p. 105) described the Richmond house into which the Allans moved in 1825: "Poe's room was at the end of a hall that ended in a wedge-shaped alcove just beyond a rather dark twist in the stairs. In this recess, . . . was a table upon which stood an *agate lamp*, always kept burning at night, because of the dark stairs and hall." The italics are Allen's, but Marie Bonaparte, *Edgar Poe*, Paris [1933], I, 75, seems to have been the first to make the connection formally.

¹³ The choice of the name Helen must be attributed to Helen of Troy, at least no evidence has turned up to the contrary, and I have found no indication that Mrs Stanard was ever called Helen except by Poe in the poem. The "hyacinth hair" is an Homeric as well as a Miltonic allusion (*P. L.* IV, 301). (In Poe's story "The Assignment" the epithet seems to suggest *curly*, in "Ligeia" he has the phrase "the Homeric epithet 'hyacinthine'"—apropos of which W. P. Trent remarks "It is perhaps pedantic to point out that 'hyacinthine' is not, strictly speaking, a Homeric epithet" (*The Raven, The Fall of the House of Usher and Other Poems and Tales*, New Edition, Boston, 1930, p. 25 n). Would it be pedantic

beauty restored his calm, brought back his better self, and reminded him of his classical studies.¹⁴ The third stanza is more precise and more troublesome. It transports us from the generalized and vague classic setting to the immediate and actual present

Lo' in that little window-niche

or, ten years later,

Lo' in that shadowy window-niche

and, lastly,

Lo' in yon brilliant window-niche

may well be a realistic but unverifiable detail, a reminiscence of Mrs Stanard. But it is also a palpable reminiscence of Byron (*Childe Harold*, III, xxiii), as pointed out by Campbell and others. Or it may be one of Poe's "Childhood memories of [Mrs Allan], after tucking him in bed, and standing within his dormer-window niche of their early Richmond home, with lamp in hand . . ." ¹⁵ And the agate lamp certainly suggests Mrs Allan, but it is a late comer. Not only in 1831, but also in 1836 and in 1841, the line read

The folded scroll within thy hand!

This has been conjectured to represent, poetically, a copy of some

to point out that Homer speaks of κόμης ὑακινθίνης ἄνθει ὀμώας (*Od.* VI, 231)? "Classic face" and "Naiad airs" are of the same pattern too general to suggest portraiture. (If Mrs Stanard resembled her son Robert, she certainly did not have a classic profile of the portrait in Caroline Ticknor, *Poe's Helen*, New York, 1916, facing p. 90. The pictures of Mrs Allan however more nearly fit the adjective.) The "Nicéan barks" have troubled all editors. "Naiad airs" hints at some connection with the Naiad Nikaia, beloved unsuccessfully by the shepherd Hymnos and later overcome, treacherously, by Dionysus himself. This would relate the barks to the Bithynian city (which was not on the Black Sea, but had a connecting waterway) and in some sense to Dionysus. But how Poe knew about Nikaia is still a mystery. A plausible association in Poe's mind with Catullus' Bithynian journey has been brought forward (*American Literature* II (1931), 433-438), which would add piquancy to the verses but throw no light on the personal equations.

¹⁴ For a more recondite interpretation see Quinn, p. 178. Mme Bonaparte suggests (I, 28) that the first stanzas may contain a memory of Poe's sight of the Elgin Marbles in London.

¹⁵ Mary E. Phillips, *op. cit.*, I, 326 f., where the passage is introduced by "Mr Gatty adds."

early verses of Poe's given to Mrs Stanard, but the conjecture is purely gratuitous. Professor Mabbott understands, more simply: "probably Mrs Stanard standing on the staircase, holding a letter or paper"¹⁶. But need it have been Mrs Stanard, and where did Professor Mabbott find the *staircase*? Finally, the "Psyche" and "Holy Land" are in odd conjunction. The former reverts to the classical tone, and is in harmony with Poe's later description of Mrs Stanard as the "purely ideal love" of his soul. Professor Quinn opines—surprisingly—that "The 'regions which are Holy Land' [*sic*] may refer to Greece and Rome, or"—more reasonably—"to the surroundings of Mrs Stanard, who was to him a sacred presence", and even more reasonably, one may add they may refer to the surroundings of his foster-mother¹⁷.

At all events, it is a tenable hypothesis (but no more) that *in the first instance* 'To Helen' was written to Mrs Stanard. The poet said so, anyway. It is also a tenable hypothesis that with her was blended in Poe's memory and imagination when he revised the original verses for publication in 1831 the figure of his beloved foster-mother, Mrs Allan. (The agate lamp, in 1845, is nearly conclusive, if we may trust Hervey Allen's record.) What, moreover, is curious and unusual in this example of composite inspiration is the entrance *ex post facto* of another figure. Poe's use of 'To Helen' as an oblique introduction to Mrs Sarah Helen Whitman is a matter of familiar knowledge. The early verses "expressed all," he wrote to Mrs Whitman in that long delicious letter of 1 October 1848—

all that I would have said to you—so fully—so accurately—and so conclusively, that a thrill of intense superstition ran at once through my frame

Think of the absolute appositeness with which they fulfilled that need—expressing not only all that I would have said of your person, but all that of which I most wished to assure you, in the lines commencing "On desperate seas long wont to roam." Think, too, of the rare agreement of name and you will no longer wonder that they wore an air of positive miracle

¹⁶ *Selected Poems*, New York, 1928, p. 122

¹⁷ It is not impossible, with due hesitation, and with complete divorce from the idealizing spirit, to give the last line an erotic interpretation. The whole poem would thus become—what in fact it appears to be—a love lyric *pure et simple*. Mme Bonaparte, though an avowed Freudian, has apparently missed this opportunity.

It was indeed a miracle in reverse. The case was in one respect similar to that sort of unconscious prophecy which has been noted in some of Rossetti's early verses and in fact may well occur at any time to others—such is the limited variety of emotions and situations in our ordinary lives. But Poe used it deliberately, and passionately, to make capital of the past for present purposes. In that excited and extravagant letter, parts of which would have made Werther blush, Poe grasped at the straw of coincidence, and, alleging "the Calculus of Probabilities," turned back to his 'boy-hood's' half-imagined Helen (who was twice his age) to plead his cause with the actual Sarah Helen (who was six years his senior)¹⁸ And Poe was the first to point to what in 1824, if the line was written then, had been a childish, or Byronic, exaggeration, and in 1831 something of a reality,

On desperate seas long wont to roam,

and now, in 1848, had become both a warning and a plea for succor. Thus Mrs Whitman has become "Poe's Helen"—there is a touch of comic irony in Miss Ticknor's title—and the Nicéan barks have come a long journey.

These barks may have brought little with them besides the weary wanderer, but he has seen some strange things and amusing, not new but newly seen—among them the vagaries of pseudo-scholarship. Poe's statement, so long after the event, that 'To Helen' was inspired by "Helen Stannard" must be received with some reservation, that it was composed when he was fourteen years old can hardly be accepted in any real sense. That he was impressed by Mrs Stanard's kindly treatment of him as her son's playmate may be readily admitted, though the external evidence is unfortunately conflicting; it may even be supposed that he wrote or began to write some verses in her honor, giving her the classic-romantic name of Helen and recording, quite truthfully, the comforting influence she had been to his boyish sorrows. But the third stanza seems more likely to have been inspired by the memory of his foster-mother and therefore to have been composed in 1829-1830 or just

¹⁸ "He seemed to connect me strangely," said Mrs Whitman, "with his memories of Helen Stanard and often declared to me that he had known and loved me ages ago. I believe that the spirit of her who bore this beloved name, has always hovered around him, and that it was in some way through *her* influence that he was drawn to me" (*Poe's Helen*, p 88).

before the publication of the poem. Many readers must have felt a difference in tone between the first two and the last stanzas, not great enough to be disturbing but nevertheless noticeable.

The most interesting result of this voyage, however, though it rests on a plausible hypothesis only, and cannot be proved—is the light thrown on the poetic process. A beautiful love lyric which to all appearance is a disillusioned *cri du cœur* turns out to have originated in a boyhood idealization of the mother of the poet's playfellow, combined with literary reminiscences and with the poignant memory of the poet's foster-mother. That these three are successfully fused cannot be questioned, but the ingredients are certainly unusual and would hardly have been suspected without the vague clues lurking in a set of ambiguous reports.

PAULL F. BAUM

Duke University

AN ECHO FROM *THE SPANISH TRAGEDY*

No play in the Elizabethan-Jacobean repertory was more frequently revived or more ubiquitously echoed or more continually parodied than Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*. "O eyes, no eyes . . ." "I was a courtier . . ." "Go by, Jeronimo!" These catch-lines, with the more sophisticated playwrights of the next decade, became bywords for the operatic and concerted rhetoric of the 'eighties. New scenes, ringing the changes on Jeronimo's lamentations, were added by other hands in the more expressive styles that had meanwhile developed.¹ To express madness, Marlowe had abandoned the formality of blank verse and introduced a kind of distracted prose.² The additions printed in the quartos of 1602 and subsequent years, following this convention, lit the old baroque night-piece with flashes worthy of Kyd's contemporary, El Greco.

The most noteworthy addition, the so-called "panther's scene," has been linked with an anecdote which Vasari narrates about

¹ This change in tone is attributed to the difference between a reading version and an acting version, by L. L. Schucking, "The *Spanish Tragedy* Additions," *TLS* (June 12, 1937), no. 1845, p. 442.

² Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, ed. U. M. Ellis Fermor, London, 1930, p. 170n.

Luca Signorelli, but though, like the latter, the painter in the play has lost a child, it is not his dead son but Jeronimo's whom he is instructed to paint.³ We need seek no source beyond that basic principle of Elizabethan dramaturgy which utilizes secondary episodes to reinforce the situation of the main plot, *e g* the Gloucester underplot of *King Lear*. The dramatic function of the painter is to transpose Kyd's obsessive theme of bereft fatherhood from a verbal to a pictorial medium. Yet pigments are as artificial and inadequate as words to realize the fullness of human suffering. Jeronimo's tirade conveys his emotions by conceding, as it were, their inexpressibility. In depicting himself as Priam of Troy, the legendary pattern of paternal woe, he completes the contrast with *Hamlet*, where the Player's speech evokes the maternal figure of Hecuba. In both cases, as in *The Duchess of Malfi*, character is portrayed as a "picture in a gallery."⁴

Now, though the painter's scene stands out from its context in *The Spanish Tragedy*, it bears a curious resemblance to two episodes in Marston's *Antonio and Melinda*, one of them not heretofore discussed. Here it is Balurdo the clown, at the beginning of the fifth act, who confronts a painter and commissions him to paint a device, "a good fat leg of ewe mutton, swimming in stewed broth of plums." *Inter alia*, he asks (1, 2, 29, 30).⁵

And are you a painter? sir, can you draw, can you draw? . Can you paint me a driveling reeling song, and let the word be, Uh

And the painter, protesting that he cannot make canvas sing, replies (33, 34)

It cannot be done, sir, but by a seeming kind of drunkenness

This courts comparison with Jeronimo's questions (108, 109, 120).⁶

³ Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. J[osef] Schick, London, 1898, p. 142. This anecdote has a peculiar literary history of its own, having inspired poems by both Graf von Platen and J. A. Symonds.

⁴ Pictures as a means of self-dramatization are instanced in M. C. Bradbrook, *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*, Cambridge, 1935, pp. 133, 134.

⁵ John Marston, *Works*, ed. A. H. Bullen, Boston, 1887, I, 76, 77. Line references are indicated above between parentheses.

⁶ Thomas Kyd, *Works*, ed. F. S. Boas, Oxford, 1901, pp. 65-69.

Art a Painter? canst paint me a teare or a wound, a groan or a sigh? canst paint me such a tree as this? Canst paint a dolefull cry?

and Bazardo's answer, that he can by a kind of optical illusion (121)

Seemingly, sir

The key that Marston strikes is characteristically ribald and discordant, but his clown is burlesquing a more doleful strain which has been sounded in the immediately previous scene. There his protagonist literally sought to transpose his emotion into song. Where Jeronimo tells his painter to "shew a passion" (146), Antonio tells his page (iv, 1, 134) ⁷

Let each note breathe the heart of passion

Always an extremist, Marston surpasses Jeronimo's "extreame griefe" (14) with Antonio's "extremest grief" (135). Both are scored to the explicit accompaniment of raving and cursing, sighing and groaning. Jeronimo wants to hear "the Belles towling" (139) and to see the landscape connive in a vast pathetic fallacy. Whereas, for Antonio, "The rocks even groan" (146), and the singer is instructed to (136, 137)

speak groaning like a bell
That tolls departing souls

The servants warn us that Jeronimo, lamenting his son (12, 13),

falls on the earth,
Cryes out *Horatio*, Where is my *Horatio*?

Whereas Antonio, mourning his lady, threatens to (140, 141)

he grovelling on the earth,
Straight start up frantic, crying, *Mellida*!
Sing but, *Antonio hath lost Mellida*

But when the page starts to sing, according to the stage direction, Antonio "breaks" the note (150, 151)

For look thee, boy, my grief that hath no end,
I may begin to plain, but—prithee sing

So Jeronimo explains to the painter that "there is no end" (152). And so the broken music of *Antonio and Mellida*, like the imagined

⁷ Bullen *op cit*, p. 68

portraiture of *The Spanish Tragedy*, acknowledges that art has more limitations than life

The quarto of Marston's play appeared in 1602 the year that saw the first printing of the augmented version of Kyd's play. However, it is commonly and plausibly assumed, on the basis of the date attached by Marston's painter to his paintings, that *Antony and Melinda* was performed in 1599. The assumption that the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* were written in 1601-2 is based on certain payments by Philip Henslowe to Ben Jonson. But critical and scholarly authorities have united, on the basis of internal and external evidence, to question Jonson's authorship of the extant scenes.⁸ Lamb and Fitzgerald, along with Maurice Castelain, would argue for Webster, Coleridge entertains the notion of Shakespeare, while C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson refuse to accept these passages for the author whose works they have served so admirably.⁹ Furthermore, Henslowe's diary seems to indicate that previous interpolations had been made in 1597.¹⁰

By accepting this date for the composition of the painter's scene, we preserve what seems to be a demonstrable relationship between the two plays.¹¹ The only logical alternative is the inference that what Jonson added in 1601 was an imitation of what Marston had written in 1599—or else the not very plausible conjecture that Marston was also the author of the additions.¹² His other works leave us with the slightly bewildered impression of an ingenious but derivative talent, a chameleon-like inclination toward *pastiche*.

⁸ Boas, *op cit*, lxxxvii. Cf. W. W. Greg's edition (*Malone Society Reprints*), Oxford, 1925, pp. xviii-xix.

⁹ *Ben Jonson*, Oxford, 1925, II, 237 ff.

¹⁰ E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, Oxford, 1923, III, 396. Chambers elsewhere begs this question (p. 430), though, in the very next sentence, he mentions Marston's borrowing of a device from *Poetaster* (1601).

¹¹ This identification is supported by the recent and thorough survey of L. L. Schücking, "Die Zusätze zur *Spanish Tragedy*," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig* (Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1938), xc, II, 34-37. On the question of authorship, Professor Schücking's last word is "vorläufig unlosbar."

¹² The *pros* and *contras* of Marston's priority are argued by R. A. Small, *The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters*, Breslau, 1899, pp. 92-93, and Friedrich Radebrecht, *Shakespeares Abhängigkeit von John Marston*, Cothen, 1918, pp. 36-38.

We know he imitated Marlowe and Chapman in *The Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image*, Donne and Hall in *The Scourge of Villany*, Jonson in *Satromastix* and *Sophonisba*, and Kyd in *Antonio's Revenge*¹³ That he is imitating Kyd's interpolator in *Antonio and Melinda* seems likelier than the converse, the clown's burlesque presupposes some serious treatment, and Antonio's lament sounds like the echo of a more spontaneous plaint

Nor do the reverberations end at this point A decade later we find Beaumont and Fletcher employing the same techniques, again in visual terms, to portray the jilted Aspasia in *The Maid's Tragedy* She too names classical prototypes for her extreme grief (Enone, Dido (II, II) And when the needlework of the ladies-in-waiting opportunely presents the story of Theseus and Ariadne, she identifies herself with the deserted heroine (63-66) ¹⁴

These colours are not dull and pale enough
To shew a soule so full of misery
As this sad ladies Doe it by me,
Do it againe by me, the lost Aspatia

She poses for them against the bleak setting of the island, "Like Sorrowes monument," and her statuesque calm contrasts strikingly with the frenetic ranting of her predecessors, Jeronimo and Antonio (74-77) ¹⁵

and the trees about me,
Let them be dry and leaveless, let the rocks
Groane with continual surges, and behind me,
Make all a desolation

A process of refinement, as well as attribution, has been at work here. The result, instead of showing or breathing passion, exhibits

¹³ The crucial example, of course, is his imitation of *Hamlet* in *The Malcontent*, which is generally dated 1604 (Chambers, *op cit*, III, 432) In the interests of his familiar hypothesis that Shakespeare was always a borrower and never a lender, an earlier dating is preferred by E E Stoll, "The Date of *The Malcontent*," *Review of English Studies* (January, 1935), XI, 42-50

¹⁴ Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Maid's Tragedy and Philaster*, ed A H Thorndike, Boston, 1906, p 48

¹⁵ These lines provide T S Eliot with the epigraph for his "Sweeney Erect," a modern example of a poetic convention which—Professor Erwin Panofsky points out—is as ancient as the Anacreontics Cf *Anacreontea*, ed J M Edmonds, London, 1931, pp 41-45

pathos That the protagonist should this time be feminine is likewise characteristic of the newer school of Jacobean dramatists

Thus the painter's scene,—itself an echo of Jeronimo's original sorrows—having been caricatured with mixed emotions by Marston, is reduced to a neat formula by Beaumont and Fletcher These three transpositions not only invoke different media painting, music, tapestry They also catch the respective moods of a fast-changing period the high pitch of the 'nineties, the self-consciousness of the transition, the polished theatricality of the Stuart court. After the Restoration Waller—who was to adapt *The Maid's Tragedy*—would renew the meaning of *ut pictura poesis*, and give his own *Instructions to a Painter* a political slant Other poets—possibly Denham—would demonstrate, in a second, third, and fourth set of instructions, how easily panegyric could be turned into satire Other variations would be played on the relationship of the various arts, from Lessing's *Laokoon* to the synesthetic experiments of the symbolists. Marvell would write, in his *Last Instructions to a Painter* ¹⁶

*Painter adieu, how will [well'] our arts agree,
Poetick Picture, Painted Poetry'*

HARRY LEVIN

Harvard University

UNITY IN *THE SECOND SHEPHERDS' TALE*

In *The Wakefield Group in the Townley Cycle* Dr Millicent Carey takes issue with the common opinion that *The Second Shepherds' Tale* lacks unity ¹ Dr. Carey, however, fails to advance a most striking argument to support her view.

The artist who wrote the play most certainly was familiar with the medieval theory that a given text might have several senses at one and the same time. This theory, at least in so far as Holy Writ is concerned, persisted in England in the fourteenth century at the time when the Townley Cycle was written It is explained as follows in the *General Prologue* to the Wycliffite Bible ²

¹⁶ *Poems and Letters*, ed H M Margoliouth, Oxford, 1927, I, 164

¹ Millicent Carey, *The Wakefield Group in the Townley Cycle*, Baltimore, 1926, p 236

² *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the*

But it is to wite, that holy scripture hath many vnderstandings, literal, allegorik, moral, and anagogik. The literal vnderstanding techith the thing don in deede, and literal vnderstanding is ground and fundament of thre goostly vnderstandings, in so myche as Austyn, in his pistle to Vincent, and othere doctouris seyn, oonly bi the literal vnderstanding a man may argue aȝens an aduersarie. Allegorik is a goostly vnderstanding, that techith what thing men owen for to bileue of Crist either of hooly chirche. Moral is a goostly vnderstanding, that techith men, what vertues thei owen to sue, and what vices thei owen to flee. Anagogik is a goostly vnderstanding, that techith men, what blisse thei schal haue in heuene.

Before the play is said to lack unity it should be assessed at these various levels.

The play possesses unity at all four levels. It is to be found in the persons of the shepherds and in their responses to two contrasted situations. It is an epic unity, achieved by having the same protagonists take part in two adventures. It is the unity of the *Commedia*.

Approaching the play at the literal level, one notes directly that the dramatis personae fall into three groups and that there are three actors in each. When the performance begins we are shortly introduced to the three peripatetic shepherds. (ll 1-189)³ This group encounters an unholy trio,—Mak, Gillot and a sheep dressed up like a baby (ll 190-632). Then the shepherds meet a holy trinity,—the herald angel, the Virgin Mary and the Lamb of God (ll 633-754). It is also literally true that Mak is a sinister clown, such a clown as might inspire a Picasso or Roualt, whereas the herald angel commands respect. The slut, Gillot, is a foil to the Virgin. The contrast between the sheep and the Lamb of God, though less sensational, is even more obvious.

If at the literal level the author seeks to please by "the rollicking comedy of the search for the sheep" and a "quiet exquisite adoration scene,"⁴ at the "goostly" levels his purpose is unmistakably to instruct. The effectiveness of having the protagonists react to and comment upon these two situations provides us with a unity which hardly could be achieved in any other way.

Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his Followers, edited by the Rev Josiah Forshall * * * and Sir Frederick Madden, Oxford, 1850, I, 43.

³ Line references are to Dr S. B. Hemingway's *The Second Shepherd's Play in English Nativity Plays*, *Yale Studies in English*, XXXVIII, New York, 1909, 189-214.

⁴ Millicent Carey, *op cit*, p. 186.

At the "allegorik," or "quid credas," level from the moment of Mak's entrance "in clamide se super vestitutes" we are suddenly aware that these shepherds are no mere hillside innocents. Their immediate response teaches us to believe that Mak is a suspicious character. His mysterious invocation of the "naymes sevyn" of his "lord" (l 190) might fool a gullible public but it does not overawe them. And since they soon identify him as a notorious sheep stealer, the audience might well believe that his "names" have some reference to the Seven Deadly Sins. The "seuen" mentioned later by the Virgin Mary could, then, be understood not only as a literal statement that God created "all on seuen" days but also an echo which would teach the auditor to remember the Seven Christian Virtues.

The fader of heuen, god omnypotent,
That sett all on seuen, his son has he sent (ll 737-8)

Even after his cloak has been snatched away, Mak stupidly persists in his futile deception, demanding "reuerence" (ll 201-5). But Mak, like the Chester Imp or Sciewtape, is ludicrous as well as fearsome, and the second and third shepherds, though both recognize something unholy about this impenitent thief, give us reason to believe that we should be amused, not impressed, by his threat to report them to his "greatt lordyng" (l 202) "and make you all to thwang" (l 211).

Having used the shrewd shepherds to teach us that Mak is not to be trusted, the playwright continues to throw out other hints that Mak is of the devil's party. There is Mak's impious prayer before he lies down between the shepherds,

Manus tuas commendo,
poncio pilato (ll 266-7)

Next there is the witchcraft by which he seeks to insure that the shepherds will remain asleep while he "borows" one of their "fatt shepe" (ll. 278-295). Still later his wife, Gillot, describes him as

the dewill in a bande,
Syr Gyl (ll 407-8)

Finally, one of the shepherds wonders whether the child of such a pair has been baptised (l 560).

What do the canny shepherds discover about Gillot? In striking

contrast to the Virgin she is apparently guilty of gluttony (l 240), lechery (l 237), sloth (l 236) and covetousness (l 459) Thus prepared we are not surprised when she also exhibits wrath (ll 299-304), pride (ll 339-43) and envy (l 315)

If we ought to believe that Mak and Gillot are a blend of the fearsome and the foolish, we should also recognize that the herald angel is proclaiming the truth about the birth of Christ Thus, the Second Shepherd confirms the *Gloria* by telling how Isaiah had prophesied that Jesus would be born of a Virgin

ffor Isay sayd so,
(Ecce) virgo
Concipiet (ll 680-2)

And the First Shepherd adds that the patriarchs as well as the prophets had "desyryd to haue seen this chylde that is borne" (l 693)

Surely it is unnecessary further to describe the reverent attitude of the good shepherds in their encounter with this holy trinity. What is important, is to remember that these men were not gullible rustics who would believe any devilish lies No, indeed The testimony of such witnesses should not be lightly dismissed

At the moral, or "quid agas," level the shepherds provide a similar unity Notable is the contrast between their boisterous "blanketing" of Mak (ll 623-32) and their adoration of the Lamb of God (ll 710-736) Also, after the performance the audience should recollect how their dismay at Mak's crooning out of tune (ll 476-482) had been contrasted with their reception of the angel's *Gloria* (ll 647-60), how their discovery of the false child which was a sheep (l 588 ff) differed from their conduct in the presence of the Lamb of God (ll. 710-36), how the inhospitable words of Gillot to her unwelcome visitors (ll. 525-38) accorded with the graciousness of the Virgin to them (ll 737-45), and how the circumstances under which one of the shepherds gave "sex pence" to Mak's foundling (l. 579) differed from those which moved them to offer tributes to the Christ Child (ll 718, 722; 734). Such recollections, incidentally, would teach us to believe that the devil and all his works are grotesque whereas manifestations of God are infinitely appealing

At the "anagogik," or "quo tendas," level it is enough to remark how effective it is to have the same shepherds who foreshadow the

torments of hell by their "blanketing" of Mak, react to a glimpse of the beatific vision at the end of the play (ll 710-754). At this level the restraint of the Wakefield author is altogether admirable in an age which was accustomed to see Hell's mouth gaping on the stage and the blisses of heaven inadequately presented in the unlikely raptures of certain representatives of a local guild.

Interpreted at any level but the literal, the protagonists give *The Second Shepherds' Tale* a striking unity. To call the Mak story a satire on the Nativity is almost perverse⁵ and to call it "a subtle foreshadowing of the scene in the stable,"⁶ litotes.

FRANCIS J. THOMPSON

The Johns Hopkins University

TWO IRREGULAR CHAUCERIAN STANZAS

In Chaucer's early poem, *An A B C*—possibly the earliest he ever wrote—occurs the following stanza:

- Ever hath myn hope of refut been in thee,
 34 For heer-biforn ful ofte, in many a wyse,
 Hast thou to misericorde receyved me
 36 But mercy, lady, at the grete assyse,
 Whan we shul come bfore the hye justyse!
 38 So litel fruit shal thanne in me be founde,
 That, but thou er that day me wel chastyse,
 40 Of verrey right my werk me wol confounde

All recent editors agree in giving the text thus,¹ yet most of the manuscripts offer a different version of the next-to-the-last line, to wit

That but thou er that day correcte me

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 184

⁶ Gordon Crosse, *The Religious Drama*, London, 1913, p. 66

¹ Skeat and Koch print it so, word for word, the Globe editor and Robinson read "wol me" in the last line. (W. W. Skeat [ed.], *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Oxford, 1899, I; J. Koch [ed.], *Geoffrey Chaucers Kleinere Dichtungen*, Heidelberg, 1928; A. W. Pollard et al. [edd.—H. Frank Heath edited the Minor Poems], *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, London, 1910—the Globe edition, F. N. Robinson [ed.], *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston, etc., 1933. My quotations are from Skeat's text.)

This variant is unanimously rejected by the editors because it destroys the rhyme scheme of the stanza, turning it into *ababbcac*, instead of the regular *ababbcbc* in which the other twenty-two stanzas of the poem are written. Since it hardly seems likely that Chaucer would deviate from his rhyme scheme in this erratic fashion, the editors seem justified, at first blush, in preferring the reading which preserves the regular pattern.

Yet one begins to wonder as one examines the textual evidence. *An A B C* is extant in fourteen manuscripts, which fall into two large groups and numerous subgroups, as follows:²

<i>a</i>	{	F	
		B	
		H ¹	
		Pb	
		Pe	
		Gg	
		Sp	
<i>b</i>	{	H ²	
		Ff	That but thou er that day me chastyse
		G	
		J	Bot thou ar that daye correcte my folise
		L	
		S	That but thou er that day me wel chastyse
		A	That bote thou or that day me chastice

The ten manuscripts above for which no reading is noted give the line uniformly as

That but thou er that day correcte me

Only four manuscripts—Ff J S A—give the required regular rhyme, three of these with lines which cannot be made to scan

² For the relationships of the manuscripts, see Koch, *Angha*, iv, b, 100, and his edition, p. 20, Skeat, i, 61, Globe, pp. xxxiv xxxv, Robinson, p. 1034. MS H², which I have put tentatively with the *a* manuscripts, cannot be placed with finality, for it is contaminated. The authorities for *An A B C* are as follows: A (Additional 36983, British Museum), B (Bodley 638, Bodleian), F (Fairfax 16, Bodleian), Ff (Ff 5 30, Cambridge University Library), G (Q 2 25, Hunterian Museum, Glasgow), Gg (Gg 4 27, Cambridge University Library), H¹ (Harley 7578, British Museum, ll. 1-48 only), H² (Harley 2251, British Museum), J (G 21, St. John's College, Cambridge), L (Laud Misc. 740, Bodleian), Pb and Pe (Pepys 2006, Magdalene College, Cambridge, ll. 1-60 only—two copies of the same sixty lines), S (Arc L 40 2 over E 44, Sion House, London), and Sp (Speght's second edition, 1602). The texts of all these authorities have been printed in the Chaucer Society Publications, where I have consulted them.

smoothly. Moreover, in Ff the words "me chastyse" are written in over an erasure, "doubtless" (as Skeat admits)³ "of the words 'correcte me'." And since the word "correcte" appears also in J, it seems clear that the exclusive common ancestor of the subgroups Ff G J L had the reading "correcte me," which remains in G and L. Obviously, too, the exclusive common ancestor of the eight manuscripts in group *a* read "correcte me." Since, then, "correcte me" is the reading of one of the two main groups, and of one of the two subgroups in the other main group, it must have been the reading of the archetype. Readings ending in "folise" or "chastyse" must be regarded as merely scribal efforts to regularize the rhyme scheme. A critical text demands the irregular reading "correcte me."⁴

An editor is still free, of course, to believe that the archetype contained an error and that therefore one of the scribal emendations should be adopted. But the meaning of the line seems to favor the reading "correcte me" rather than "me wel chastyse." Chaucer is praying the Virgin for mercy against the day of judgment on that day his works will be found so unacceptable (unless before then the Virgin *corrects* him) that he will be lost. Correction—that is, improvement—in him and his works is what is needed, not chastisement. The sense is better with the irregular rhyme.

A final reason for believing that the irregular rhyme of the stanza is due to Chaucer himself is that in one other poem, written in precisely this same metre and rhyme scheme, he commits precisely the same irregularity. The sixth stanza of *The Former Age* runs as follows.

Yit were no paleis-chaumbres, ne non halles,
42 In caves and [in] wodes softe and swete
Slepten this blissed folk with-oute walles,

³ Skeat, I, 454.

⁴ There is, of course, nothing un-Chaucerian in the resulting identical rhyme between "receyved me" (l. 35) and "correcte me." On the contrary, the device was common both in the French poets whom Chaucer was imitating and in Chaucer himself. Indeed, Chaucer not infrequently employed identical rhymes in this very stanzaic form, at least a half-dozen of them involving the rhyme of the penultimate line, as in "correcte me" (see the following rhymes in the *Monk's Tale*: "wight," ll. 3457-59; "tweye," ll. 3542-47, "two," ll. 3640-43, "doun," ll. 3654-59, "reed," ll. 3734-39; "he," ll. 3904-07).

- 44 On gras or leves in parfit quite
 No doun of fetheres, ne no bleched shete
 46 Was kid to hem, but in seurtee they slepte,
 Hir hertes were al oon, with oute galles,
 48 Everich of hem his feith to other kepte

The reading "with-oute galles" (l. 47) yields the same irregular rhyme scheme (*ababbcac*) as the reading "correcte me" does in *An A B C*, and there can be no doubt that the irregularity here is genuinely Chaucerian, for the manuscripts⁵ are unanimous⁶.

The reason why Chaucer fell into this irregularity in two of the 135 stanzas that he wrote in this form⁷ may only be conjectured. In each instance he may have made a careless slip, or he may have discovered, in composing, that the irregular rhyme came easily, and so set it down with light unconcern over the resulting inconsistency in stanzaic pattern.⁸ Certainly had he noticed the irregularity, and cared to correct it, he could have done so with the utmost ease, despite the "scarsitee" of "rym in English."⁹ Anyone capable of such *tours de force* as *Fortune*, *The Complaint of Venus*, the balade *To Rosemounde*, and the envoy of the *Clerk's Tale* could not have suffered too great "penaunce" in the comparatively easy rhyming of *An A B C* and *The Former Age*.

J. BURKE SEVERS

Lehigh University

⁵ We have only two, both at Cambridge University Library Hh 4 12 and Ii 3 21.

⁶ There is this further similarity between *An A B C* and *The Former Age* both poems are translations—the former from Guillaume de Deguileville's *Pèlerinage de l'Âme*, the latter from Boethius' *Consolatio Philosophiae*, Bk. II, Metre 6. Unfortunately, Chaucer handles both originals so freely in the passages involved ("correcte me" and "with-oute galles") that it is impossible to get any evidence based on closeness to the original.

⁷ *An A B C*, *To Rosemounde*, *The Former Age*, *Fortune*, *Envoy de Chaucer a Bukton*, and the *Monk's Tale*. Skeat is inaccurate in classifying the *Complaint of Venus* under this stanzaic form (its scheme is *ababbccb*), I, lxxi-lxxiii, he repeats the inaccuracy at I, 61 and VI, lxx.

⁸ A chief feature of the *ababbcb* rhyme scheme is the interlocking repetition in the second quatrain of one of the rhymes from the first, and this feature is preserved just as readily by an *a* rhyme in the penultimate line as by a *b*. Moreover, when an *a* rhyme is substituted for the *b*, an artistically finished stanza results, with no unrhymed lines hanging in air. There was no reason for Chaucer's artistic sense to be offended by a stanza rhyming *ababbcac*, only consistency of stanzaic pattern was being violated.

⁹ See the envoy of the *Complaint of Venus*.

A NOTE ON *THE RHYTHM OF BEOWULF*

Professor Pope, in his excellent study of the rhythms of *Beowulf*, finds two obstacles to an acceptance of Heusler's system of notation, the less important of which deals with tempo

If we take the implications of Heusler's $4/4$ notation seriously, we shall find ourselves embarrassed by the slow pace at which the normal verses must be read. Experiments with watch and metronome alike have convinced me that these admittedly quadruple measures ought to be called $2/4$ (or more exactly $4/8$), not $4/4$. In the normal lines of *Beowulf*, I read between 50 and 70 measures in a minute. This means that, if we call the time $4/8$, there will be between 100 and 140 quarter notes to the minute—about the same number that we find in musical compositions of medium tempo. A $4/4$ notation for the same reading would give between 200 and 280 quarter-notes to the minute, a range of tempos well beyond the bounds of those ordinarily employed by musicians. Doubtless one cannot dogmatize about the pace at which the old poetry was read. Thus, although fifty measures to the minute is as slow a pace as I can set without feeling that the longer syllables are being held beyond endurance, a still closer approach to song than my own reading might make still slower tempos endurable. But surely not a tempo twice as slow! ¹

To take exception to this, which Professor Pope himself labels "comparatively unimportant," is perhaps to quibble, but one feels that his treatment of it is extremely confusing, if not downright incorrect.

The confusion arises from the implication that a change in notation from $4/4$ to $4/8$ will result in a changed (i. e., faster) tempo. That such is not the case is readily apparent. If we set a metronome at 120 and count out ten measures of $4/4$ music by its beat we will find that they take up 20 seconds, if, without changing the metronome setting (or *tempo*), we alter the notation to $4/8$ and time the same ten measures, we learn that they still need 20 seconds.

It may be convenient to record faster tempos in notes of lower denomination, but to imply that these notes cause the faster tempo is to reverse cause and effect. The fact is that Professor Pope reads between 50 and 70 four-beat measures per minute, which will thus

¹ John Collins Pope, *The Rhythm of Beowulf* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), pp. 26 f.

be 200 to 280 beats per minute—this tempo will remain constant whether the separate beats are designated by quarter-notes, eighth-notes, half-notes, or, as in Heusler, by non-musical symbols

That Professor Pope recognized this is indicated by his statements "the eighth-note has no absolute duration, only a customary range of durations," and, "Heusler called the time 4/4, I call it 4/8, but *both readings have virtually the same pace*"² I find this impossible to reconcile with the paragraph quoted above I would insist on substituting "exactly" for "virtually" Professor Pope, however, immediately upon making these statements launches into a discussion of the "so-called hypermetric verses" and is back in the original confusion He discovers that "4/4 time really belongs to" these verses, and that "as soon as we adopt a 4/8 notation for the normal verses, we discover that" they cannot be included in the same notational scheme with the hypermetric ones. In demonstrating the "truth" of this assertion he again seems to overlook the fact that at a given tempo a sixteenth-note in 4/8 time is exactly equal in duration to an eighth-note in 4/4

The error lies in the apparent assumption that a given note has an intrinsic time value and thus determines tempo, whereas actually the exact reverse is true the value in time of any note is determined by the tempo

The point at issue, it would seem, is one which Professor Pope recognizes but does not clearly state It is simply that for the normal verses a 4/8 notation is the most convenient, while for the hypermetric ones a 4/4 time proves simpler There is no *compelling* reason in favor of any notation One simply consults his ease, and that of his readers

Therefore, while Professor Pope's notation is easier to read and, doubtless, more convenient to write, it no more determines the tempo of the reading than does Heusler's³

RAYMOND E PAST

University of Texas

² *Ibid.*, p 27 The italics are mine

³ The error has been given further circulation by Professor Kemp Malone, *A Literary History of England*, ed Albert C Baugh (New York Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc, 1948), p 25

ANGLO-SAXON SPINSTERS AND ANGLO-SAXON
ARCHERS (TWO STEPS TOWARDS A
STUDY IN EXTENSION)

1.

In a recent number of this journal¹ Mr A J A. Waldock makes a convincing effort to explode Edmund Wilson's often-printed theory that *The Turn of the Screw* is "simply a variation on one of Henry James's familiar themes the frustrated Anglo-Saxon spinster"² The phrase raises questions What distinguishes "Anglo-Saxon" spinsters from other spinsters? Does being "Anglo-Saxon" make for frustration? For the adjective—and the phrase—Mr Waldock is indebted to Edmund Wilson rather than to Henry James³ Not that the novelist was averse from using the term "Anglo-Saxon," in the sense which may be labeled "Malone I,"⁴ for he did use it, albeit more sparingly than one might expect considering his preoccupation with the "Americano-European prospect"⁵ On several occasions the word serves James's com-

¹ *MLN* LXII (1947), 332 See also Lyon N Richardson, *Henry James* (1941), p lxxxvif

² Edmund Wilson, *Hound and Horn*, VII (1934), 391, *The Triple Thinkers* (New York, 1938), pp 131-32, *The Question of Henry James*, ed F W Dupee (New York, 1945), p 167

³ As early as 1918 J W Beach (*The Method of Henry James*, p 189) varied the phrasal pattern when he referred to "those starved New England spinsters set before us in some of the later stories of James" Earlier (p 144) Beach observed that in James's typical characters "the psychology is Anglo-Saxon, and what is more, Anglo-Saxon of Concord and Cambridge, Mass"

⁴ See Kemp Malone, "Anglo-Saxon A Semantic Study," *RES* v (1929), 184

⁵ Preface to *The Reverberator and Other Tales* (New York Edition, 1908), p xii For James "Anglo Saxon" was apparently synonymous with "Anglo American" In Lubbock's edition of James's letters "Anglo Saxon" occurs only half a dozen times, between 1888 and 1909 Before 1888 the concept is expressed by such phrases as "our race" or "of the English race" In 1903 the term still relates to a "human Anglo Saxonism" (I, 418); not until 1906 does it take on a satirical or disparaging connotation, as in "this unutterable Anglo-Saxon banality" (II, 49, see further II, 99, 138) It is significant that after 1909 and in the "war letters,"

parative purpose In *The Reverberator*, one of the tales cited by Wilson, James resorts to repetition (for emphasis) in observing what a "true Anglo-Saxon" would have done in the place of the "effusive and appealing and ridiculous and graceful" Frenchman, Gaston Probert⁶ And in his most successful novel, *Daisy Miller*, the compound appears as an adjective "The young American, who said nothing, reflected on that depth of Italian subtlety, so strangely opposed to Anglo-Saxon simplicity"⁷ But recent critics⁸ of the novelist appear to have taken over the term more completely than the novelist himself Stephen Spender⁹ almost paradoxically considers James "the greatest of a line who owe more to an un-English (a Celtic and a Continental) tradition than to the purely Anglo-Saxon one Joyce, Yeats, Ezra Pound and Eliot" Again "Anglo-Saxon" comes close to having its broadest meaning¹⁰

where James shows a "passionate loyalty to the cause of the Allies" (II, 381), he never uses the term—William James, who uses it disparagingly twice in two sentences (Matthiessen, *The James Family* [1947], p 520) appears to apologize for it when he speaks of Kipling as "the mightiest force in the formation of the 'Anglo Saxon' character"

⁶ *Ed cit*, p 202 Note Beach's difficulty (p 142) "while I cannot at all clearly explain what I mean, I feel that [James's] appeal is necessarily limited to the Anglo Saxon moral sentiment"

⁷ New York Ed (1909), p 58 In *Washington Square* (1880) Catherine Sloper grows into "an old maid" and "a kindly maiden aunt" (chapter 32) but James never calls her an "Anglo Saxon spinster" The nearest approach to the phrase that I have found in James occurs in *The Notebooks* (ed Matthiessen and Mudock [1947], p 275) where he outlines the idea for a tale of a "yearning woman with her 'Anglo-Saxon' clinging to the impossible thesis"

⁸ Among them Beach, Van Wyck Brooks, R P Blackmur, Louise Bogan, Theodora Bosanquet, Dorothy Bethurum, Frank Moore Colby, Edmund Gosse, F O Matthiessen, Philip Rahv, Stuart P Sherman, Spender, and Glenway Wescott Lyon Richardson (*op cit*, pp lxix, lxxv f) prefers the adj "English-American", Cornelia Kelley (whose *Early Development of Henry James* [Urbana, 1930] is indispensable) tells me that to use the term "Anglo Saxon" would probably never have occurred to her

⁹ *The Destructive Element* (Boston, 1936), p 12, see also p 199 On the Celtic element in James, who became "the family Anglophile," see Matthiessen, *The James Family*, pp 4-5, 99, 103, 110, 270, 284-86

¹⁰ "Anglo-Saxon" novelists like Arnold Bennett seem to prefer the adjective "Teutonic" to express the same contrast for example, "She loved the French race, but all the practical Teutonic sagacity in her" [rebelled] (*The Old Wives' Tale*, new ed [New York, 1911], p 406) In-

2.

Professor J. E. Harry¹¹ has distinguished Sophocles' Ajax from the traditional Ajax of Homer—"the sinewy soldier, burly, rude in speech, who is like the Anglo-Saxon warriors that fought under the Black Prince, 'little blest with the soft phrase of peace, with the glib and oily art to speak and purpose not'" The four-fold borrowing from Shakespeare¹² is amusing when one recalls that the speakers who thus describe themselves were far from being Anglo-Saxon—Othello the Moor and Cordelia the Celtic daughter of a Celtic king Here indeed the adjective "Anglo-Saxon" appears to combine the "inclusionist" meaning with the "exclusionist" sense (disregarding Othello) of "pre-English"—or, better, "pre-Old-English"!¹³

Shakespeare, whose plays of legendary Britain before the Anglo-Saxon invasions offer a fruitful hunting-ground for collectors of anachronisms, showed a greater consistency It is noteworthy that in *Cymbeline* and *Lear* the dramatist sedulously avoided reference to "England" and "English" Instead he makes frequent use of the words "Britan," "British," and "Briton",¹⁴ even Lear's fool knows that his country is not England but the Celtic "realm of Albion"¹⁵ But twentieth-century writers show less respect for

stead of "Anglo-Saxons" the solid citizens of the Five Towns are called "Britons" So, too, Galsworthy, see below

¹¹ *Greek Tragedy* (New York, 1933), I, 99

¹² *Troilus and Cressida*, II iii 259, *Henry V*, I ii 105-110, *Othello*, I iii 81-82, *King Lear*, I i 227 It is Ulysses in the first of these plays who describes the "sinewy Ajax" Strictly Anglo-Saxon warriors could scarcely have won at Crecy, even under the Black Prince, they could only have marveled at the use of longbows and crossbows

¹³ See Malone, *art cit*, pp 179 ff

¹⁴ In the two plays "British" occurs five times, and nowhere else in Shakespeare Of the 27 occurrences of "Britan" in Shakespeare, 24 are in *Cymbeline*, of the 17 occurrences of "Briton" all are in *Cymbeline* Nowhere does Shakespeare mention "Anglo-Saxons" or "Angles", his only "Saxons" (*Henry V*, I ii 46, 62) are the heathen race "subdued by Charles the Great" In *Macbeth*, as Kemp Malone has pointed out (*Anglia* LV [1931], 5), Shakespeare "refers often to the English of Saxon times" but calls them simply the English

¹⁵ *King Lear*, III ii 91. In *Cymbeline* (IV ii 99, 123, etc.) Shakespeare remembers that London is the Celtic "Lud's town," and that Arveragus, true to his race, should wear "clouted brogues" (IV ii 214) Other

racial distinctions, which appear to have been lost in the adjectival melting-pot, without—it may be added—loss to literature or lucidity. Pope Gregory, who learned in the sixth century to associate Englishmen with angels, would not have recognized as an Englishman the patriarch whom Galsworthy would class with Sylvanus Heythorp¹⁶ as “Old English” “He was that rather rare thing a pure-blooded Englishman, . . . and it is probable that Norse and British blood were combined in him in a high state of equality . . . Thus, to the making of him had gone land and sea, the Norseman and the Celt.”¹⁷

ROLAND M SMITH

The University of Illinois

GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH AND MILTON'S *COMUS*

There occurs in Milton's *Comus*¹ a somewhat unusual example of symbolic incongruity which seems to have escaped special attention Professor Hughes does, to be sure, notice Milton's dilemma² but can only call attention to it in the midst of his multifarious duties as editor

Celticisms could be pointed out in both plays see my “King Lear and the Merlin Tradition,” *MLQ*, vii (1946), 153-74 From a pedantic point of view, Kent's references to Sarum and Camelot and Dover are more convincing on the lips of a third-century Briton than his mention of Anglo Saxon Lipsbury There are, of course and of necessity, other anachronisms in *Cymb*, iii 1, Posthumus “the Briton reveller” could have landed in Cambria but never at (Scandinavian) Milford Haven, whose Celtic name has not survived The pedant might object to the Bard's “Albion” as being Gaelic rather than British—or for that matter, to his writing the play in “English” in the first place Reduced to absurdities of such consistency, great plays would become the “hobgoblins of little minds”

¹⁶ The hero of both the short story “A Stoic” (1916) and the play “Old English” (1924) was “traditionally of Danish origin, . . . of a family so old that it professed to despise the Conquest” (*Caravan*, p 40) Was Galsworthy aware that the name “Heythorp” is less “Old English” than an Anglo-Saxon Scandinavian hybrid? Later in the story (p 83) Heythorp is further called an “old Roman,” a designation fully justified when one considers his “Christian” name!

¹⁷ “A Portrait,” in *Caravan* (New York, 1925), p. 116

¹ Merritt Y Hughes ed, *Paradise Regained, The Minor Poems and Sampson Agonistes* (New York, 1937), pp 216-71 Cited Hughes

² Hughes, pp 260-61, note to ll. 825-34.

The incongruity involves the figure of Sabrina, the water-sprite through whose agency Chastity, symbolized in the person of the Lady, triumphs. Historically, Sabrina is, because of her immediate origins, the most unfortunate choice for the role assigned her, that Milton could have made. And Milton knew of these origins quite well. Why then did he assign such a role to Sabrina? I submit that the answer to this question can be perceived, at least in part, by considering the circumstances surrounding the poem's composition. Such a consideration will, in turn, throw light on and furnish an interesting example of, the processes of aesthetic and intellectual discrimination involved in the creative activity of an artist at work.

First then to Sabrina's unfortunate origins and Milton's knowledge of them. Geoffrey of Monmouth³ tells of the capture by the British king Humber of the Germanic princess Astrild while Humber was waging war in Germany. Defeated in battle by Locrin, Humber drowns in the river which bears his name. Locrin instantly falls in love with Astrild even though he has promised to marry Gwendoln, daughter of Corineus, eponymous ruler (*dux*) of Cornwall. Locrin is forced by public opinion to marry Gwendoln but, after the marriage, installs Astrild as his mistress in London where he visits her under the pretext of worshipping in secret (. . . *fingebat se velle occultam sacrificium dñs suis facere*)⁴. This situation continues for seven years, by which time Locrin has by Astrild, a daughter Habren (old Welsh *Hafren*)⁵ and, by Gwendoln, a son, Madan. On the death of his father-in-law Corineus, Locrin deserts Gwendoln and proclaims Astrild his queen. Gwendoln defeats Locrin in battle, where he is killed by a flying arrow. The victorious Gwendoln then causes to be drowned both Astrild and Habren in a river which, to commemorate the name of her rival's daughter, Gwendoln causes to be named Sabrina (. . . *qui nunc Sabrina dicitur fecitque edictum per totam Britanniam ut flumen nomine puellae vocaretur*).⁶ Surely in light of this tragic history, which Milton knew quite well,

³ Acton Griscom ed., *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth* (London, 1929) pp 254-57. Cited Geoffrey.

⁴ Geoffrey, p 256.

⁵ Cp Eilert Ekwall, *English River-Names* (Oxford, 1928), pp 358-59. Cited Ekwall.

⁶ Geoffrey, pp 256-57.

Sabrina, though herself innocent of any wrong-doing, cannot be thought of as having particularly chaste origins, or as being unequivocally suitable for the role she plays in *Comus*.

Milton's awareness of the Sabrina story is confirmed in his *History of Britain*⁷ where he states that "the principal author" (1 e for early British history) "is well know'n to be Geoffrey of Monmouth"⁸ Indeed Milton's account of Sabrina⁹ is a close paraphrase of that of Geoffrey¹⁰

How then did Milton come to indulge in the aesthetic and, for so unequivocal a moralist elsewhere, the moral incongruity of choosing as the protectress of chastity the unfortunate Sabrina who, however innocent herself, was nevertheless the child of illicit and unsanctified love? The answer lies in part, in a consideration of the circumstances surrounding the poem.

The immediate occasion of the poem is the inauguration of the highest judicial officer of Wales, one of Britain's Celtic areas. The site of the celebration is in Shropshire, near the Welsh border, at Ludlow Castle on the river Teme which is a tributary¹¹ of the Severn. Having sketched out the framework of his poem Milton, remembering the legendary Welsh material of Geoffrey, decides that the Sabrina story will be quite appropriate in view of the political and geographical circumstances surrounding the production of *Comus*.

But what is to be done about Sabrina's unfortunately unchaste origins? Milton decides that the story is already old and its details, if they were familiar, are by now so insecurely fixed in the popular memory, that he may by skillful manipulation proceed with the Sabrina story. All that is needed are a few deft strokes of the pen to so limn in her portrait, that her innocence and virginity are high-lighted and the less desirable aspects of her immediate origins subdued. How is this to be accomplished?

At least four separate pieces of tactics can be discerned in Milton's solution of this problem. The first of these is to em-

⁷ George Philip Krapp ed., *The History of Britain* (New York, 1932)
Cited *History*

⁸ *History*, p. 6

⁹ *History*, pp. 15-16

¹⁰ *Geoffrey*, pp. 254-57. Cp. *Hughes*, p. 261, note to ll. 825-34 who notes this close agreement.

¹¹ *Ekwall*, p. 398

phasize Sabrina's innocence and virginity at death. Hence the constant repetition of such epithets as 'gentle Nymph' (l. 824), 'Virgin pure' (l. 826), 'guiltless damsel' (l. 829), etc. Indeed in the 113 lines devoted to Sabrina's part in the poem (l. e. ll. 824-937) such epithets as these just quoted are so numerous as to arouse one's attention. The second tactic is to refer to Gwendolin, the lawful wife of Sabrina's natural father, Locrin, as Sabrina's 'step-dam' (l. 830). This accomplishes two things: the familiar folklore image of the cruel stepmother who capriciously murders her innocent stepdaughter is conjured up, and the real origin of Sabrina is neatly disguised. Next, emphasis is placed on the political respectability of Sabrina's paternal ancestry:

Virgin daughter of Locrine
Sprung of old Anchises' line (ll. 922-23)

Lastly, we are told of Sabrina that,

She, guiltless damsel, flying the mad pursuit
of her enraged stepdam Gwendolen
Commended her fair innocence to the flood (ll. 829-31)

It is thus implied that Sabrina voluntarily sought death in the Severn to avoid the insane rage¹² of Gwendolin. That Gwendolin murdered Sabrina to rid herself of all trace of her husband Locrin's illicit love for Gwendolin's rival Astrild, is nicely evaded.

Thus, by the exercise of aesthetic and intellectual discrimination, Milton is able to take the figure of Sabrina, as she appears in Geoffrey's legendary Celtic material, and transmute her felicitously, and with consummate art, into the figure he wished to create for the role assigned her in *Comus*. The deftness with which this transmutation is wrought is such that we are hardly aware of it, and it furnishes us with an interesting insight into the processes of artistic, here specifically poetic, re-creation.

R. BLENNER-HASSETT

Stanford University

¹² Cp. the '*insania furens*' of Geoffrey, p. 256, with 'the fury' of Milton's *History*, p. 15.

THE BAD WEATHER IN *A MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM*

The famous bad-weather speech of Titania in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*¹ is one of the few passages in Shakespeare which can almost certainly be said to contain direct topical references. So detailed and extended are the allusions to constant rains, ruined crops, and altered seasons in this speech that we can hardly doubt that it had a special significance for Shakespeare and his audience. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the play, or at least this part of it, was written during, or immediately after, a period of unusually bad weather in England. At the very least, we can assert that the play was probably not first produced in a period of normal weather and good harvests. The date of the stretch of bad weather to which Shakespeare seems to be referring in this speech is, then, a matter of some importance in fixing the chronology of his work.

Most scholars have rather confidently associated Titania's remarks with the rainy summer of 1594,² though some have more cautiously stated that they would suit any year from 1594 to 1596.³ And, at first glance, the summer of 1594 seems to fit ideally the necessary conditions. There were heavy rains in May, June, and July, with further heavy rains in September causing floods and wrecking bridges.⁴ In one important respect, however, the weather described in Titania's speech differs from that of 1594. Shakespeare specifically and at some length tells us that the corn rotted in the fields before it ripened.

The ox hath therefore stretch'd his yoke in vain,
The ploughman lost his sweat, and the green corn
Hath rotted ere his youth attain'd a beard

¹ II, i, 81-117

² See, for example, A. Quiller Couch and J. Dover Wilson, ed., *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* (New Cambridge Edition, 1924), ix, 95-6, 114, E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1930), i, 360, and Peter Alexander, *Shakespeare's Life and Art* (London, 1939), 105.

³ G. L. Kittredge, ed., *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (Boston, 1936), 229; Hazelton Spencer, *The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* (New York, 1940), 234.

⁴ John Stow, *A Summarie of the Chronicles of England* (London, 1598), Ee5v.

⁵ *M. N. D.*, II, i, 93-5.

But Stow tells us that notwithstanding the rains of the previous months, "there followed a faine haruest in the moneth of August . . . [the] dearth happened more by meane of ouermuch transporting by our merchants, than the unseasonableness of the weather passed" ⁶

If the summer of 1594 only partially fits Shakespeare's description, the summer of 1595 does not fit it at all. Somehow, the idea seems to have become established among Shakespearean scholars that the pattern of unseasonable weather set in 1594 continued through 1595. So far as I have been able to discover, however, there is not the slightest bit of evidence to indicate that there was anything strange or abnormal about the weather of the spring and summer of 1595. Stow, who generally goes out of his way to comment on any unusual trick of nature, does not discuss the weather of that year at all. Even more revealing is the language of a royal proclamation of 1596, a year when, as we shall see, the weather was bad beyond all previous Elizabethan experience.

The sellers of Corne, as rich Farmers, and Ingrossers, do pretend to raise the prices by colour of the unseasonableness of this Sommer yet that being no iust cause to raise the prices of their olde Corne of the last yeeres growth ⁷

According to the government, then, the excuse of unseasonable weather which was used for raising the price of 1596 wheat had no validity for 1595 wheat. The obvious deduction, therefore, is that 1595 was a normal year. If this is so, it is difficult to see how Titania's speech could have been written at any time between the summer of 1595 and that of 1596.

Not only, however, could Titania's speech have been written to describe the disastrous summer of 1596, it fits the weather of that period so perfectly that one is tempted to say it must have been written with the summer of 1596 in mind. The weather of 1596 is described as follows by Stow:

In this moneth of May (as afore) fell continuall raines euey day or night, wherethrough the waters, growne deepe, brake ouer the high wayes, namely betwixt Olford & Stratford the bow, so that market people riding towards London, hardly escaped, but some were drowned. Also towards Lambeth, in the high way, people not on horsebacke were borne on mens backes, or rowed in wherries . . .

⁶ Stow, *op. cit.*, Ee5^r

⁷ *A Proclamation for the dearth of Corne* 31 July, 1596. (S T C 8251)

This moneth of June and also the moneth of July, was euey day raine (as afore) more or lesse to the end

This yeare, like as in the moneth of August, so in September, October, and Nouember fell great raines, wherevpon high waters followed ⁸

That these heavy rains of 1596 were incomparably worse than those of 1594 is shown by the following remarks of William Barlow, in a dedicatory epistle to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated November 9, 1596

[The dearth in Basil's,] time comming of a long drought, ouis of neuer ceasing raine, then the heavē being cleare and cloudlesse but the Skie ouer us lowring and Sunlesse Yet who so observed our heaue heauens this present yeare, the like not remembred by any man liuing, by any record remayning, if he fauour of any religion, he cannot ascribe it either to the Climate, or inclination of our Skie, or to the Vicinitie of the sea, but crie out as they did *Exod* 8 19 *This is the finger, if not the heaue hand of God* ⁹

Another passage in the same volume supplies conclusive evidence that the dearth of 1596 was caused by the rotting of the corn in the fields

Oft tymes againe it happeneth that the cause of *Dearth* may come by continuall Raine, the seede perishing by too much wette [as it happened this year 1596 in England, wherein God hauing opened his bottles hath made the cloudes which should drop fatnesse to poure downe the moisture of rottennesse] ¹⁰

On the basis of the bad-weather allusions in the play, therefore, the fall or winter of 1596 seems the most probable date for the initial production of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*. There is nothing, either in the style of the play or in what little other evidence we have concerning its history, to make such a date unlikely. It is possible that the play was written for a noble wedding, but noblemen were married in 1596 as well as in 1594 or 1595. Perhaps, in the light of the evidence discussed in this note, the suggestion ¹¹ that the play was written for the double wedding of Lady Elizabeth and Lady Katherine Somerset to Henry Guildford and

⁸ Stow, *op cit*, Ff1r-Ff2v

⁹ Ludwig Lavater, *Three Christian Sermons*, tr by W Barlow (London, 1596), A3v-A4r

¹⁰ *Ibid*, C7r (The section in brackets is added by the translator)

¹¹ Burns Martin, "A Midsummer Night's Dream," *T L S*, January 24, 1935

William Petre on November 8, 1596, should be given more serious consideration than it has yet received

SIDNEY THOMAS

Queens College

OPHELIA'S "NOTHING"

Mr Eric Partridge, in his *Shakespeare's Bawdy* (London, 1947), has failed to perceive the beautifully apt climax of the "country matters" dialogue in *Hamlet*, III, II, 119-129. Ophelia's reply to Hamlet's outrageously paronomastic "Do you think I meant country matters?" (adequately explained by Partridge, p. 95, though editors have pretty consistently shied away from pointing out the indelicacy) is, "I think nothing, my lord."

Ham That's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs

Oph What is, my lord?

Ham Nothing

Hamlet (or Dick Burbage) might well at this point have made the "nothing" symbol by joining thumb and forefinger, although the gesture is not at all necessary to "get over" the joke—the word itself in this context would, I think, have been sufficient to titillate the quicker wits in the audience.¹ In any event, Ophelia's "You are merry, my lord" indicates that she got the point well enough, though it is doubtful that many modern readers do—even including so perceptive an observer of "country matters" in literature and language as Mr Eric Partridge.

For Hamlet's *nothing*, a reflection of Ophelia's earlier use of the word, is unquestionably yonic symbolism, a shape-metaphor intended to call to mind the naught, or O, which is elsewhere in Shakespearean, if not in modern, "bawdy" a symbol of *pudendum muliebre*. So understood, the passage takes on a beautiful clarity. "Fair thought" is, of course, a quibble—"happy idea" and "pretty trifle" (v *NED* "thought," definition 6), as Professor Dover Wilson has recognized,² "That [*nothing* meaning *puden-*

¹ For *thing* with similarly "broad" meaning, cf. Partridge, *s. v.*

² *Hamlet* (Cambridge, 1934), p. 199. Dover Wilson also got the point of "nothing," as his reference to O with identical meaning in *Rom*, III, III, 90, and *Cymb*, II, v, 17, would indicate. To these he might appositely

lum]'s a fair thought [a pretty trifle] to lie between maids' legs," in addition to the more readily apparent meaning

Partridge has recognized that there is a wealth of yonic symbolism in Shakespeare. If the Elizabethan meaning of *nothing* and *naught* (*nought*)³ be recognized and added to those "country" references which he glosses, this anatomical localization of sexuality becomes considerably more impressive. There is certainly pudendal suggestiveness in Flute's "A paramour is, God bless us, a thing of naught" (*M. N. D.*, IV, II, 13-14), which Partridge thinks means no more than "worthless" and "obscene", but the pun is actually triple-barreled, if *naught* be understood as a sexual reference, as I am convinced it would have been at the Globe. *Naughty* has similar triple paronomasia in Elbow's "This house, if it be not a bawd's house . . . is a naughty house" (*Meas.*, II, I, 77-78). It seems likely also that Cressida's "You smile and mock me, as if I meant naughtily" (*Troil.*, IV, II, 38) is more indelicate than it first appears. In any case, I think it safe to assume that Shakespeare was perfectly well aware of the "loose" meaning of *nothing* and *naught(y)* in the venereal vernacular of his day, and that the use of these words in the passages cited, and perhaps in others, could not have failed to provoke guffaws from the groundlings and civil leers from the gentles.

THOMAS PYLES

University of Florida

MAUPASSANT'S PARIS ADDRESSES

Maupassant's meteoric rise in letters and his corresponding prosperity as a professional writer are significantly indicated in his successive Paris addresses. There could be no more striking graph of material success than one which began in dingy one-room

have added those to the more obvious synonym *naught* (or *nought*), some of which I shall later cite.

³ Cf. the erotic symbolism of *circle* (*Rom.*, II, I, 24) and *ring* (*M. of V.*, V, I, 307, reminiscent of Hans Carvel's ring). Partridge thinks the sexual circle "physiologically inaccurate" (s. v. "circle," p. 87), but it is no more so than the conventionalized lozenges which carnal-minded moppets used to (and may still) scrawl on walls and fences as a representation of what, following the chaste example of the ending of Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, I shall indicate here merely as —————

quarters on the rue de Moncey and ended in the sumptuous apartment on the rue Boccador

But these changes in lodgings have more than a sociological import for Maupassant scholars, particularly for those interested in his correspondence. For many of his letters do not bear a complete date, instead, they merely indicate either the day of the week on which they were written, or else the day of a particular month. Since, however, Maupassant frequently wrote on imprinted stationery bearing his Paris address, a knowledge of the dates of his successive addresses becomes of utmost importance to the scholar attempting to clarify a biographical or literary detail in Maupassant's career through his correspondence, much of which still remains unpublished.

A description of Maupassant's various Paris lodgings was given some twenty years ago by an intimate friend of the author of *Boule de Suif*, Léon Fontaine, who was none other than "Petit Bleu" in the famous story, *Mouche*.¹ But the indications relating to the extremely important factor of dates can now be corrected and amplified on the basis of documents which were not available to the authors of that account. The tables given below, prepared by the present writer while at work on a group of unpublished Maupassant letters, should therefore be of considerable utility to workers in the field.

2, rue Moncey 1871(?) - 1876.

Maupassant was released from the army, following the Franco-Prussian war, in the fall of 1871, and began his duties at the Navy Ministry in Paris in March, 1872. According to the testimony of Léon Fontaine, the small ground-floor room of the rue Moncey constituted Maupassant's first Paris address. There is as yet no clear evidence, however, as to exactly when Maupassant moved into those modest quarters. It seems unlikely that he should have settled in the Montmartre section of the capital when he arrived in Paris before the war, to study law. His published correspondence offers no clues. It contains but eleven letters written before 1875.² Among the several letters written in 1875, we find the only letter in the entire correspondence bearing the rue Moncey address, a letter addressed to Edmond Laporte.³

¹ Petit Bleu and Pierre Borel, "Les Logis de Maupassant," *Nouvelles Littéraires*, 18 janvier, 1930.

² *Chroniques, Etudes, Correspondance de Maupassant*, Paris, Librairie Grond, 1938, pp. 194-203.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 206-7.

17, rue Clauzel⁴ 1876-1881.

According to Léon Fontaine, Maupassant was still living on the rue Moncey when he was transferred from the Navy Ministry to the Ministry of Education. However, the transfer did not occur until 1878, whereas in his published correspondence there are two letters written in 1876 bearing the rue Clauzel address, the first dated November 28, 1876, and the second, December 12, 1876.

Moreover, the 78-page manuscript of a first version of Maupassant's play, *La Comtesse de Rhetune*, on which he was at work in 1876, was sold at the Suzannet sale of 1938. That manuscript bears Maupassant's signature and his address, 17, rue Clauzel.⁵

83, rue Dulong 1881-1884

Following the success of his first collection of short stories, *La Maison Tellier*, in 1881, Maupassant moved to the more spacious quarters of the rue Dulong.⁶ An undated letter bearing the Dulong address is ascribed by René Dumesnil to 1881.⁷ And although François thinks they moved out on April 3, 1884,⁸ a letter in the correspondence bearing the Dulong address is dated April 16.⁹ Still another letter, bearing the Dulong address but undated, is ascribed by René Dumesnil to May, 1884.¹⁰ The exact date of his next address is now revealed in the hitherto unpublished letter given below.

10, rue Montchanin 1884-1889

The following communication, addressed by Maupassant to his cousin Louis Le Poittevin, in whose newly built house he was to live for five years, establishes the date of his next move. This note, in the present writer's collection, is accompanied by its original envelope, bearing an Etretat postmark with a July 8, 1884 date.

G M

LA GUILLETTE (ETRETAT)

Mon cher Louis,

Je serai à Paris vendredi à 4h30. Je voudrais bien te voir ce jour-là.

⁴ It is unnecessary to enter here into the old and interesting question as to whether Maupassant lived at 17 or 19 rue Clauzel. Even if he did actually live at the latter address, his official address remained 17.

⁵ *Catalogue d'éditions originales, de manuscrits et de lettres autographes de Guy de Maupassant, provenant de la bibliothèque de M^e le comte de S* [uzannet] Paris, Giraud Badin, 1938, p. 7.

⁶ Petit Bleu and Pierre Borel, *op cit*.

⁷ *Op cit* in note 2 above, p. 295.

⁸ *Souvenirs sur Guy de Maupassant*, par François, son valet de chambre (1883-1893) Paris, Plon, 1911, p. 6.

⁹ *Op cit* in note 2 above, p. 322.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 323.

même afin de pouvoir apporter le lendemain une partie de mon mobilier, car le tapissier declare le déménagement impossible le 15 juillet, lendemain de la fête

Mille tendresses
Guy¹¹

14, avenue Victor Hugo · 1889-1890.

According to François, whose memory is not always reliable, Maupassant moved into his new quarters on November 20, 1889¹² There are only two letters in Maupassant's published correspondence which bear this address, neither of which is dated¹³

24, rue Boccadore 1890-1892

In a letter to his mother, written in July, 1890, Maupassant says, "Je ne couche pas encore rue Boccadore, où on porte, chaque jour, mes meubles Je m'y installe samedi, mais j'y passe mes journées"¹⁴

In January, 1892, Maupassant's two attempts at suicide led to his internment at Dr Blanche's asylum in Passy, where he died on July 6, 1893

ARTINE ARTINIAN

Bard College

A PRELIMINARY NOTE ON GOETHE AND ANDRÉ GIDE

In spite of the facile yet unprofound comprehension which has led so many students of the work of André Gide to classify him as a disciple of Nietzsche, or at least to attempt to relegate him to the Nietzschean tradition, a careful observation of the journals of Gide leads one to the conclusion that this universal mentality of the twentieth century owed its primary formation among foreign influences to quite another nineteenth century figure, that is, to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.

During the period of Gide's *Journals* and such related works as the *Interviews Imaginaires* from 1889 to the present, out of nearly three hundred and fifty references to German artists, Gide refers directly to Goethe over one hundred twenty times The range of Gide's interest in German thinkers is almost limitless and covers

¹¹ The envelope is addressed to Monsieur Louis Le Porttevin, 10 rue Montchanin, Paris

¹² *Op cit* in note 8 above, p 217

¹³ *Op cit*. in note 2 above, pp. 374-75

¹⁴ *Ibid*, p 387

university professors, critics, authors, painters and musicians. No phase of German culture is unobserved, at least in some degree, by this extraordinary Frenchman. In the case of Goethe, however, we are in the presence of something much more important than mere observation, as this disproportionate number of references would seem to indicate. It is on Easter Sunday of 1892, when he was twenty-three years old, that Gide makes the first direct reference to Goethe in his *Journal*. "Lu des poésies de Goethe, le *Prométhée*"¹ It is, of course, only in the light of what follows in the next half century that this very abbreviated mention of the great German takes on the profound significance which we can now see it possesses. Between that almost haphazard remark and the last sentence of his *Introduction au Théâtre de Goethe* lies a most revealing series of observations which leave no doubt that the tremendous influence of Goethe upon Gide must yet be investigated. The sentence stands as the culmination of a lifelong admiration for the German poet, and is impressive because it contains what is possibly the most complete tribute one human being can pay to another. "Nous restons reconnaissants à Goethe, car il nous donne le plus bel exemple, à la fois souriant et grave, de ce que sans aucun secours de la Grâce, l'homme, de lui-même peut obtenir"²

One of the determinants of the degree of a writer's interest in another and the consequent possibilities of influential direction as a result of that interest will be the number of aspects under which he is viewed. In this case, we can see that Gide observes Goethe from the most varied points of view. The young Gide, himself tormented by scruples, transfers his own anxiety into speculations concerning the psychology of Goethe.

Disons nous donc maintenant que le bonheur s'obtient par la suppression des scrupules? Non. Supprimer les scrupules ne suffit pas à rendre heureux, il faut mieux. Mais des scrupules suffisent à nous empêcher le bonheur, les scrupules sont des craintes morales que des préjugés nous préparent. C'est une harmonie non comprise, on croit pouvoir se séparer, aller seul, et aussitôt l'on s'oppose. Un soliste doit jouer dans le sens d'orchestre. (A étudier) Ames scrupuleuses, âmes timorées et qui

¹ Gide, André, *Journal* (Améric-Édit) 4 vols. Rio de Janeiro, 1945. Vol. I, p. 32.

² Gide, André, *Interviews Imaginaires*. Jacques Schriffin, N. Y. C. (Pantheon) 1943. p. 165.

s'oppriment elles mêmes, elles auront peur de la joie, comme de l'éblouissement d'une trop éclatante lumière ³

The important matter here is not that a specific work of Goethe is discussed, the important matter is that Gide is already so steeped in Goethe that the German becomes a point of departure for the speculations of the young Frenchman, and that, perhaps unconsciously, Gide is developing an attitude of acceptance or rejection of the evils of life, as he stands upon the shoulders of the sage of Weimar. The cycle of transfer is completed and the speculation has brought Gide, at the conclusion of the passage, back to himself and to his own psychological development.

The mature Gide, himself grown into a figure quite as Olympian as Goethe, observes the boyhood foibles of the German in a remarkable passage from the *Introduction au théâtre de Goethe*. In the passage Gide, while writing of Goethe as a great teacher, throws into clear and pitiless light the egotistical tendencies of the German. The boy Goethe has just been told of the death of his younger brother. "Tiens!" he cries, "regarde tout ce que j'avais déjà écrit pour son éducation" ⁴

Gide seldom indulges in a purely literary criticism of Goethe. Indeed, four-fifths of the references to the German are quite general, and concern his philosophy or his life without so much as a mention of a specific work. It is simply that among all the other ambient influences of Gide's life, Goethe stands in a very special relation of spiritual kinship to him. It is to Goethe that Gide makes constant reference as a point of speculative departure. Indeed, in his discussions of other Germans, Goethe is frequently used as a standard of comparison. Gide writes, for example, "Tandis que Hugo trouve satisfaction de son délire verbal à se perdre dans une confusion panique, Goethe, même dans ses effusions les plus lyriques, tend à nous ramener au pratique" ⁵

Implicit in all of his remarks is the fact that Goethe stands quite alone, in a very special place, among the influences in Gide's life, and, consequently, in his work. It is not a question of tracing

³ Gide, *Journal* I 46. Gide makes this a point of departure for a rather lengthy inquiry into a psychology of resignation and personality development.

⁴ Gide, *Interviews Imaginaires* p. 130

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132

literary minutiae, of tracking down images or themes. It is rather that Goethe becomes for Gide a great example, a wise counsellor and friend. In the *Introduction* Gide writes

" Il semble n'être lancé dans la vie que pour cela 'servir d'exemple à l'univers' 'Wie ich ein Beispiel gebe'—'que je devienne un exemple' ce sont les dernières paroles qu'il prête à Egmont. Et ce rôle, à lui dévolu, Goethe l'assume avec plénitude, conscience, et une confiance qui se confond très vite avec la croyance en une sorte de fatalité."⁶

Such an influence, wide as broad as it is, must challenge anyone who would completely understand Gide, and there is perhaps no better basis for our feeling that further investigation is in order than Gide's own words. "La grande influence que peut-être j'ai vraiment subie c'est celle de Goethe."⁷

ROBERT K. BISHOP

University of Pennsylvania

A PLAGIARISM FROM QUEVEDO'S *SUEÑOS*

The influence of Quevedo's *Sueños* is obvious in many of the long prose works of Francisco Santos (1618-1699?), the Spanish moralist, novelist, and *costumbrista*, and has been pointed out in a general way by all critics who have dealt at any length with Santos. It has been shown that Quevedo's statement concerning a play by his enemy Montalbán "Dispararon los mosqueteros toda su mosquetería, de modo que la comedia, ya como toro, murió entre silbos, ya como soldado valiente, a mosquetazos" finds an echo in Santos' description of a friend's unsuccessful *comedia*. "En fin su comedia/ como soldado valiente,/ pues a puro mosquetazo/ antes de acabar se muere."¹ No mention has been made, however, of a much more extensive borrowing in Santos' *El Rey Gallo* (1671). Here Santos follows closely the beginning of Quevedo's *Sueño de la muerte* (reprinted in 1629 as *Visita de los chistes*), as the following parallel passages show

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 133

⁷ Gide, *Journal*, III, 109

¹ J. Calvert Winter, "Notes on the Works of Francisco Santos," *Hispania* (California), Vol. XII (1929), p. 460

Fueron entrando unos médicos a caballo en unas mulas, que can gualdrapas negras parecían tumbas con orejas. El paso era divertido, torpe y desigual, la vista asquerosa de puro pasear los ojos por orinales y servicios, las bocas emboscadas en barbas, que apenas se las hallara un brazo. Eran éstos en gran número, y rodeados de platicantes, que cursan en lacayos, y, tratando más con las mulas que con los doctores, se gradúan de médicos.

Alrededor venía gran chusma y caterva de boticarios con espátulas desenvainadas y jeringas en ristre, armados de cala en parche, como de punta en blanco, y luego ensaitan nombres de simples, que parecen invocaciones de demonios: Bupthálmus, opopánax, leontopétalon, tragoriganum. Y sabido que quiere decir tan espantosa baraúnda de voces tan rellenas de letrones, son zanahoria, rábanos y perejil y otras suciedades.

Luego se seguían los cirujanos cargados de pinzas, tientas, cauterios, tijeras, navajas, sierras, limas, tenazas y lancetones. Entre ellos se oía una voz muy dolorosa a mis oídos, que decía:

— Corta, arranca, asierra, despedaza, pica, punza, ajigota, rebana, descarna y abrasa.

En tanto vinieron unos demonios con unas cadenas de muelas y dientes, haciendo bragueros, y en esto conocí que eran sacamuelas, el oficio más maldito del mundo, pues no sirven sino de despoblar bocas y adelantar la vejez. Estos, con las muelas ajenas y no ver diente, que no quieren ver antes en su collar que en las quijadas, desconfían a las gentes de Santa Polonia. . . No he tenido peor rato que tuve en

Iban los médicos hechos unas tumbas con orejas, passo divertido, y torpe, como la vista está enseñada a mirar orinales, tan cerrados de bolsa, como otros tiempos de barbas. Iban cercados de practicantes, que más servían de lacayos de las mulas, que de discípulos de doctor.

Seguíanles los boticarios, cargados de espátulas, y jeringas, calas, y parches, y a cualquiera palabra respondían. Que linda jeringa. Los médicos hablaban un lenguaje medio griego como Rultitacmus, Leon tope-latum, Trogaricarum, y todo este follage quiere decir rábanos, nabos, y zanahorias.

Seguían los barberos y cirujanos, con sus vihueltas en las manos, guarnecidos los vestidos de pinzas, tientas, tijeras, navajas, sierras, limas, tenazas, y lancetones. Iban con grande algazara, diciendo: Quebra, arranca, corta, despedaza, abre, asierra, y descarna.

Siguéronle los sacamuelas, almas de cementerios, o cementerios de huesos. Llevaban al cuello sartas de muelas, y colgajos de quixadas, de bragueros vestidos, anuncio de algebristas, y en las manos unos gatillos.

(*El Rey Gallo*, Valencia, 1694, pp 126-127)

ver sus gatillos andar tras los
dientes ajenos

(*Los Sueños, Clásicos Castellanos*,
xxxi, pp 200-203)

This borrowing is incorporated by Santos into a still longer plagiarism from Gracián's *El Criticón* ²

JOHN H. HAMMOND

The University of Texas

PONTUS DE TYARD AND THE *QUERELLE DES FEMMES*

Pontus de Tyard's role in the perennial sentimental and psychological squabble that broke out with renewed vigor upon the publication of Héroet's *La Parfaicte Amye* in 1542 has apparently escaped notice. His *Erreurs Amoureuses*, mentioned by Abel Lefranc in this connection,¹ was at most an indirect contribution to the defense. He struck a much stronger blow for the beleaguered sex in the *Premier Solitaire*, first published in 1552. In this dialogue, when his lady Pasithée asks why the Muses are females, her mentor gravely replies,

Il est evident que les perfections sont nommees en plus grand nombre
femelles que masles, ainsi que la femme est embellie de plus de diverses
perfections que l'homme. Donq, entre les autres, estant les vertus et les
sciences feminines, il sembloit estre necessaire que les Muses encor fussent
nommees de mesme sexe, pour montrer, qu'ainsi que la femme est excel-
lemment constante, l'erudition et la vertu sont la plus stable et immuable
possession que l'on se puisse acquerir,

obviously taking special pains to deny the frequent allegations of infidelity. Pasithée answers gratefully, "Je vous remercie, Solitaire, de l'avantage que vous donnez à ce sexe accusé ordinairement d'inconstance et de legereté." ²

² *El Criticon*, ed M. Romera Navarro, Philadelphia, 1940, III, 340-361. Cf. *El Rey Gallo*, Valencia, 1694, pp 121-140. Santos' borrowings from Gracián are discussed in detail in the writer's Ph.D. dissertation, *Francisco Santos' Debt to Gracian*, University of Texas, May, 1948.

¹ *Œuvres de François Rabelais*, ed A. Lefranc, et al., 1931, *Introduction*, p. liv.

² *Discours philosophiques*, 1587, p. 22 vº.

Pontus was an intimate friend of Louise Labé, and undoubtedly knew Pernette du Guillet and other poetesses and writers. In 1554 he had paid a visit to the learned Marguerite du Bourg, Dame de Gage, to whom he dedicated the first edition of his *Discours du Temps*, two years later.³ That he welcomed to Bissy learned ladies as well as men is shown by a remark of Le Curieux, rationalist spokesman of the *Discours Philosophiques*, in the *Second Curieux*: "Les beautés et bonnes grâces qui sortent de ceans nous remetroit facilement en mémoire les anges et les belles âmes à l'entour desquelles nostre discours d'hier fut arrêté." When Pontus expresses gratification at the impression Pasithée has made upon his guests, Le Curieux declares that her perfection proves a point: "La femme ne doit céder à l'homme en aucune perfection d'esprit."⁴

These comments, which remain unchanged in the final edition of 1587, were of course more pertinent in 1552 or 1557. Realizing this, perhaps, Pontus had long since suppressed his most eloquent plea for womanhood, the preface to the first edition of the *Premier Solitaire*, written in the heat of the conflict. This six-page essay (for it inevitably reminds one of Montaigne's earlier efforts), addressed to all "Doctes, Gentils et gracieux esprits françois," leans heavily on Plutarch's *Mulierum Virtutes*, which had been translated three years before by Denys Sauvage, probably to provide ammunition for the feminists.⁵ The author sets out purposefully to refute "certains Thucydides de ce tems," pointing to the valorous women of antiquity, citing the feats of the Amazons,⁶ and praising women of intelligence and creative ability like Sappho and Pythagoras' daughter, Areta. To disprove the accusation of infidelity he gives examples of chastity, among them, inevitably, Lucretia. Presenting his final example, he cries triumphantly,

Peuvent ne voir les taupes de ce siècle la splendeur d'une et une autre Princesse Marguerite? Desquelles celle nous laissa autant de duel et

³ Lyon, 1556

⁴ *Discours philosophiques*, 1587, p. 289 r°

⁵ *Des vertus et illustres faits des femmes*, Lyon, 1549

⁶ Pontus' preface anticipated most of the arguments put forth by Charles Estienne, *Que l'excellence de la femme est plus grande que celle de l'homme*, 1554. Cf. L. M. Richardson, *Forerunners of Feminism in French Literature of the Renaissance*, Johns Hopkins, 1929, pp. 103-104. Miss Richardson incorrectly states that Jacques Tahureau was the first to mention the Amazons in feminist literature.

mescontentement a sa mort, comme ceste nous apporte d'admiration par la perfection de sa doctrine et accomplissement de ses graces¹

The defense concludes with the hope that the "tenebreux misogynes" will no longer be blinded by stupid malice and with a summons to all learned spirits to join him in singing the perfections of womanhood

Both as a neoplatonist disciple of Ficino who translated Leo Hebraeus' dialogues on ideal love, and as a rationalist who was aware of the increasing importance of woman's role in society, Pontus de Tyard belonged in the feminist camp That he was also a man in love with one "qui seul pourroit prouver par preuve de ses graces divines qu'à tout vertueux exercice vous (les femmes) estes nées,"² may also have influenced his decision

JOHN C LAPP

Oberlin College

US JOIS NOVELS, COMPLITZ DE GRANS BEUTATZ

The five stanzas beginning *Us jois novels, complitz de grans beutatz*, attributed by two of the Old Provençal *chansonniers* to Aimeric de Peguilhan, are in reality only a part of the poem of Daude de Pradas, *Ben ay' Amors, quar anc me fes chauzun* Since the beginning is different, it is not surprising that no one has noticed this fact before Both Bartsch and Pillet-Carstens¹ accept the attribution to Aimeric without question, and evidently the editor of the poems of Daude de Pradas (Mr A H Schutz)² did not happen to stumble upon this poem of Aimeric It was only an accident that brought the identity of the two poems to my attention in the course of preparing an edition of Aimeric looking

¹ *Preface, Premier Solitaire*, 1552

² K Bartsch, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der provenzalischen Literatur*, Elberfeld, 1872, Pillet Carstens, *Bibliographie der Troubadours*, Halle, 1933 The second work is a revision and an amplification of the first Both assign the number 10, 53 to the poem as it appears under Aimeric's name, and 124, 6 to the poem of Daude de Pradas Designations of MSS in this article are taken from these works (see particularly Pillet Carstens, p x and following)

³ *Poésies de Daude de Pradas*, publiées par A H Schutz, Paris Toulouse, 1933 (Bibliothèque Méridionale, 1^{re} série, tome XXII)

up a word in Levy's *Supplementwörterbuch*, I found quoted there the same passage I had before me, but ascribed to Daude de Pradas

There is little doubt that the poem is really the work of Daude. It is attributed to him by twelve MSS (*ACD^aD^cFGIKMNRf*) and by Matfre Ermengaud in the *Breviari d'amor*,³ where the first stanza is quoted. It is anonymous in *O*. Only two MSS (*CR*) attribute it to Aimeric de Peguilhan, and both also contain the complete poem, correctly ascribed to Daude de Pradas, more accurately, *C* contains the complete poem; the version of *R* lacks the fifth stanza, according to Mr Schutz's edition. Aimeric's claim to the poem is therefore very slight.

Daude's poem, as it appears in Mr Schutz's edition, has six stanzas and a *tornada*. The version attributed to Aimeric begins with the second stanza, and lacks the *tornada*. It is, furthermore, considerably garbled in meter and rhyme. I say "the version" rather than "the versions," because the readings of the two MSS evidently derive from a single original, as the errors of one are repeated in the other.

Taking all these facts into account, we can say with some certainty that the attribution to Aimeric was a mistake on the part of the compiler of one of the common sources of *CR*. Such mistakes are common enough in the Provençal MSS, as a glance at Pillet-Carstens will show. Occasionally it is possible, from an examination of the extant MSS, to see how the error arose,⁴ but more often we are forced to admit that we do not know. In the present case, nothing in the form or content of the poem suggests Aimeric rather than any other troubadour; and the order of poems in the MSS would not seem conducive to an erroneous attribution of this sort, nor, to the best of my knowledge, is there any other confusion of the poems of Daude and Aimeric. A possible explanation, which I advance only as a guess, is this. The five stanzas in question appeared on one folio of a collection in small format, on loose sheets, the beginning and the end of the poem were on other folios. This folio was introduced by accident among the poems of Aimeric de Peguilhan, and the stanzas (minus beginning and end) were then thought to be his, and were so ascribed in one of the

³ Edited by Gabriel Azaïs, Béziers-Paris, 1862-1881, lines 28549-56

⁴ See my note "On the Attribution of a Provençal Poem," in *Modern Language Notes*, May, 1947

common sources of *C* and *R*. This would account for both the truncations and the attribution.

Since the poem has already been edited critically,⁵ I offer here a complete set of variants (apart from minor details of spelling) from *C*, folio 98, and *R*, folio 49 (the versions attributed to Daude de Pradas appear on folios 167 and 31, respectively). These readings are from my own copies from the MSS. Unless otherwise noted, all variants are given in the spelling of *C*, but are common to both *C* and *R*.

Variants

II 9 (joves cors) ioyz nouelhs, (gran beutat) grans beutatz 10 (guais) guay, (cortes) cuende, (de bon agrat) e de bon grat *C*, de bon grat *R* 11 (fis) fin, (renovelhatz e sors) ualen e melhurat 12 (alhors) dalhor *C* 13 (q'ieu) que, ni m vir *lacking* 14 (tir) an 15 (li vet nulh temps ni l tuelh) lur uedi ni lur tuelh 16 (Amors) amor

III 17 (Gaugz e plazers) Gaug e plazer, (ven) ue, (mi) men 18 (e) be, (tan m'es bon a souffrir) quan men ue a fugir 19 (molt) trop 20 (don so) des so *C*, de so *R* 21 (qu'ieu no vuelh ges aver quist ni trobat) e ges no uuelh per res auer conquist 22 (dona que m'aya trop leu joi donat) belha donna que leu magues (magues leu *R*) ioy dat 23 (aduy) adutz 24 (aduy) adutz

IV 25 (Merces) merce 27 (dels maltragz) del maltrag, (lone temps) tostz temps 28 (Razos) amors 29 (torna) sembla 30 (per folh) per fols, (mi) men *C*, me *R* 31 (no s no s) nom nom 32 (tan) tal

V 34 (qu'ieu) *quem*, (e) o *C* 35 (Razos) merce, (traï, de lai, sas ricors) tra de lieys sa ricors 37 (ges) ylh, (fina) ni sa, (lauzors) ualors *C*, ualor *R* 38 (escuelh) erguelh *C* 39 (dieus d'amor) drech damors *R*, (a ben) o a

VI 41 (devet) desuiest, (destuelh) despuelh 42 (ans) e 43 (cap duelhs e gutz e tois) cap dels tors e palays 44 (e m pays tot jorn de pessamen onrat) totz iorns *et er* (e ser *R*) de pensamens honratz 45 (De) Del *R*, (paguat) paguatz 46 (no l'enguana de re lo miradors) quar nol enguana de rel miradors 47 (onrar) amar 48 (e qui s vol) quis uuelha

These MSS thus present a version substantially different from that of any of the MSS considered by Mr Schutz: phrases and whole lines are totally unlike anything in his text or variants. I have already mentioned the faulty meter and rimes (cf lines 11, 13, 21, 43). The deviations in lines 15, 18, 22, 35, 44, and 46 are equally striking.

The MSS of the version attributed to Daude which come closest

⁵ Schutz's edition (see note 2, above), pp 12-17, no III

to our text in individual lines are *AD^aD^cOR* (17), *IKR* (28), *C* (32), *MNOR* (41), *MNOR* (46), *R* (48). The common term of all but one of these groups is *R*. From this, one might judge that *R* was closest of all to our text, but, according to Mr. Schutz, *R* does not contain stanza five, which is present in the version we are considering. Even so, it is not impossible that our version and that of *R* (folio 31, under the name of Daude) were derived, at a few removes, from the same source, since the omission of this stanza in *R* is probably due only to careless copying.

If anyone cares to confirm the statements made in this article, he can consult Mahn's *Gedichte*,⁸ where the versions of *C* and *R* ascribed to Aimeric are printed under the numbers 1218 and 1219, respectively. The accuracy of my readings can be checked from reproductions of the two MSS made by the Modern Language Association of America, and now on deposit in the Library of Congress (MLA deposit, nos 293 and 918, respectively). It is to be regretted that Mr. Schutz's edition of Daude de Pradas, like many another useful Provençal text, is found in so few libraries in this country. I could not find a copy in the Chicago area, and was obliged to obtain one by inter-library loan from the Ohio State University Library, a favor for which I should like to express my gratitude here.

FRANK M. CHAMBERS

Northwestern University

MARIE DE FRANCE, *LAIS*, PROLOGUE, 13-16

A recent article by Professor L. Spitzer indicates that the Prologue to Marie's *Lais* shows a consciousness on the part of the poet of her rôle as "*poeta philosophus et theologus*"¹. If one accepts this general thesis, it may be possible to clarify lines 13-16 in the light of current exegetical practice. After saying that the ancients deliberately composed their works with a certain obscurity, Marie warns (ll. 13-16)

⁸ A. Mahn, *Gedichte der Troubadours in provenzalischer Sprache*, Berlin, 1856-73 (4 vols.)

¹ *MP* XLII (1943), 96-102

Pur ceus kī a venir esteient
 E kī aprendre les deveient,
 K'ī peussent gloser la lettie
 E de lur sen le surplus mettre ²

Professor Ewert supplies a literal translation of the Prologue in his notes, where the above passage is rendered

so that those who were to come after them and were to learn them, might construe their writing and add to it from their own ingenuity ³

If we take *lettie* and *sen* as technical terms, and suppose *surplus* to be a synonym for a third technical term which would be understood in the light of the first two, the translation may be made more precise

In the schools of the twelfth century a given text was studied on three levels. The process is explained clearly in a recent study of medieval education

Elle (*expositio*) comprenait trois sortes d'explications, appelées *littera*, *sensus* et *sententia*. *Littera*, c'était l'explication grammaticale, *sensus*, le sens que donne à première vue la *littera*, et *sententia*, l'intelligence profonde de la pensée de l'auteur, le contenu doctrinal. Ces trois explications se suivaient naturellement dans l'ordre où nous les avons énoncées, une fois données toutes trois, l'exegèse est parfaite. "Quid enim aliud in lectura queritur quam textus intelligentia, que *sententia* nominatur," dit Robert de Melun ⁴

This method was applied not only in the study of profane authors, but in the study of Scripture as well ⁵. Theologians of the period frequently show profound contempt for those who understand only the sense of Scripture and cannot proceed to the *sentence* ⁶. It

² *Lais*, ed. Ewert (Oxford, 1944), p. 1

³ *Ibid.*, p. 163

⁴ G. Pare, A. Brunet, P. Tremblay, *La renaissance du XII^e siècle les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris, Ottawa, 1933), p. 116. A first hand description of the process may be found in the *Didascalion* of Hugh of St. Victor

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 228

⁶ Thus, for example, Bruno Astensis, *Comment in Matth.*, Pars IV, Cap. XXII, *PL*, 165, 252: "ut ergo longo vivimus tempore, dimittamus avem et litteram quae occidit, teneamus pullos et ova, id est spirituales intelligentiam quae vivificat. Nos enim in civitate Dei, nos in sancta ecclesia harum nuptiarum delicias edimus; illi autem in villa morantur, illi in grosso pane litterae, et rusticano cibo delectantur. In villa enim sunt quicumque extra Ecclesiam sunt."

is not impossible that a similar attitude may have prevailed among those whose concern was either the study or the composition of profane texts ⁷

The terms *littera*, *sensus*, and *sententia* suit the context of Marie's prologue with striking appropriateness. The philosophers of olden times wrote with the awareness of the *sententia* which should arise from their texts ⁸

Pur ceus kī a venir esteient
E kī aprendie les deveient,
K'ī peussent gloser la lettre (*littera*)
E de lur sen (*sensus*) le surplus (*sententia*) mettre

In other words,

so that those who were to come after them and to learn them might gloss the letter or grammatical structure and from the apparent sense determine the doctrinal content

Perhaps we should inquire into the possible *sententiae* of Marie's *Lais*.

D W ROBERTSON, JR

Princeton University

JEAN LEMAIRE ET LA COMPLAINTE DE MARGUERITE D'AUTRICHE SUR LA MORT DE SON PÈRE

Dans "la Première Epistre de l'Amant Verd, à Madame Marguerite Auguste" qu'écrivit Jean Lemaire de Belges peu de temps après la mort de Philibert le Beau (septembre 1504), nous lisons les vers suivants

Bien me plaisoit te voir tant estre aymee
De deux seigneurs, de haute renommee
Lun fut d'Espagne, et lautre de Savoie,
Que plus bel homme au monde ne sauoie ¹

⁷ For a late instance of this attitude, see the Prologue to Usk's *Testament of Love*, ed Skeat, *Chaucerian and Other Pieces* (Oxford, 1897), p 1

⁸ The idea is not far-fetched. Cf Philosophy's remarks to Boethius, *De consolazione*, I, Pr V "Itaque non tam me loci huius quam tua facies movet, nec bibliothecae potius comptos ebore ac vitro parietes quam tuae mentis sedem requirō, in qua non libros, sed id quod libros pretium facit, librorum quondam meorum sententias conlocavi."

¹ *Œuvres de Jean Lemaire de Belges*, p p Stecher (Louvain, 1885), III, 7

Il existe une "Complaincte que faict la fille unicq de Maximilien Empereur Depuis son douloureux trespas" On trouve ce poème dans plusieurs mss, et, en particulier, dans la chronique de Nicaise Ladam Marguerite exprime ses sentiments de tristesse et de mélancolie Personne, dit-elle, n'a souffert autant que moi les quatre princes que j'aimais le mieux au monde sont morts mes deux maris (Juan d'Espagne et Philibert le Beau), mon frère (Philippe le Beau) et mon père (Maximilien d'Autriche)

Les deux premiers se furent mes marys
Dont maintes gens eurent les coeurs marris
Prince d'Espagne, et le ducq de Savoye
Que plus bel homme au monde ne scavoie ²

L'Épître fut publiée en 1511,³ Maximilien mourut le 12 janvier 1519. Non seulement les passages des deux pièces que nous venons de citer sont de même inspiration et ont le même ton, mais le dernier vers est exactement le même dans les deux poèmes et la rime équivoquée est aussi la même Si c'est bien Marguerite qui a composé la "Complaincte," elle s'est, vraisemblablement, souvenue plus ou moins consciemment de l'Épître de Jean Lemaire.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

CHAUCER'S "AIRISH BEASTS"

Among the wonders seen by the dreamer of the *House of Fame* as he travels through the upper air in the grasp of the eagle are "the eyryssh bestes" With a warning against being "adrad," the eagle calls the dreamer's attention to them

² Marcel Françon, *Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche* (Paris-Cambridge, 1934), p. 257

³ Jean Lemaire de Belges, *La concorde des deux langages*, éd. J. Frappier (Paris, 1947), xiv, n. 1 M. Frappier a donné une édition des Épîtres de l'Amant Vert qui a paru en 1948, mais que nous n'avons pu consulter On ne pourra s'empêcher de remarquer que M. Jasinski a été mal inspiré quand il a dit de Jean Lemaire "à l'instar de Catulle, dans ses deux *Épîtres de l'Amant Vert*, il chante joliment la mort de Marguerite d'Autriche en faisant exhaler par un perroquet une plainte légère" (*Histoire de la littérature française*, Paris, 1947, I, 132)

' For in this region, certeyn,
 Duelleth many a citezeyn,
 Of which that speketh Daun Plato
 These ben the eyryssh bestes, lo' ' ¹

The timorous dreamer plucks up courage and looks about

Tho gan y loken under me
 And beheld the ayerissh bestes,
 Cloudes, mystes, and tempestes,
 Snowes, hayles, reynes, wyndes, ²

Skeat interpreted the phrase as a reference to the signs of the zodiac and other constellations bearing animal names ³ Robinson, however, following W P Ker, ⁴ believes that the "eyryssh bestes" are probably the daemons of the air ⁵ Ker showed that Chaucer derived the rather unexpected word *citezeyn* from the "*aerios cives*" of the *Anteclaudianus* of Alanus de Insulis, a work that Chaucer mentions by name in line 986, and that the *bestes* goes back to Augustine's "*aeria . . . animalia*," which in turn stems from the *De Deo Socratis* of Apuleius, "where the derivation of the whole theory from Plato is sufficiently acknowledged" ⁶ All of these writers are discussing the daemons of the air, intermediaries between the gods and men If Chaucer is indeed following Alanus and Apuleius, as Ker suggests, then he too must be thinking of the daemons of the air

One bit of evidence which has been overlooked, however, gives support to the earlier view of Skeat In lines 940-956, which come between the two references to "airish beasts," Chaucer gives a greatly condensed paraphrase of the Phaethon story, as told by Ovid in *Metamorphoses*, II, 47-313. ⁷ There are two references to beasts

¹ *House of Fame*, 929-32 This and the following quotation are from F N Robinson, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston, 1933

² *Ibid.*, 964-67

³ W W Skeat, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2d ed., Oxford, 1900, III, 263

⁴ W P Ker, "Chaucer, 'House of Fame' (II 417-426)," *The Modern Quarterly*, I, No 5 (1899), 38-39

⁵ Robinson, *op cit*, 892

⁶ Ker, *loc cit*, 38

⁷ In addition to the overwhelming probability that Chaucer would go to his favorite Ovid for this story, there are some definite verbal parallels

HF 941 f the sonnes sone, the rede,
 That highte Pheton

of the air in this passage, both clearly referring to the zodiacal signs. The first is in Phoebus' warning to Phaethon of the dangers of the journey

pei insidias iter est formasque ferasum¹
 utque viam teneas nulloque errore traharis,
 per tamen adversi gradieris cornua tauri
Haemoniosque arcus violentique ora Leonis
 saevaue circuitu curvantem biacchia longo
Scorpion atque aliter curvantem biacchia *Cancrum* ²

The second immediately precedes the description of Phaethon's terror at the sight of the Scorpion

sparsa quoque in vario passim miracula caelo
vastarumque videt tiepidus simulacra ferasum ³

It seems hardly likely that Chaucer would overlook these two vivid pictures of the zodiacal signs as wild beasts

Chaucer's references to "airish beasts" who are also "citizens" thus seem to be a blend of Alanus' "*aerios cives*" and Ovid's "*simulacra vastarum ferarum*" The paraphrase from Ovid and the reference by name to the *Anteclaudianus* indicate that both were in his mind, while the reference to "daun Plato" seems to include either Augustine or Apuleius (or both) among the influences on this passage. Perhaps Chaucer himself did not quite know whether he intended to describe daemons or zodiacal animals. But his repetition of the Ovid-inspired "beasts" seems to indicate that the images of the Bull, the Crab, the Ram, the Fishes, the Scorpion, the Lion, and the Goat were dominant in his mind.

W. NELSON FRANCIS

Franklin and Marshall College

<i>Met</i> I, 751	Sole satus Phaethon
<i>HF</i> 950 ff	And he, for ferde, loste hys wyt Of that, and let the reynes gon Of his hors
<i>Met</i> II, 200	mentis inops gelida formidine lora remisit
<i>HF</i> 955 f	Til Jupiter, loo, atte laste, Hym slow, and fro the carte caste
<i>Met</i> II, 312 f	pariterque [pater omnipotens] animaque rotisque expulit

¹ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, II, 78-83. This and the following quotation are from the Loeb Classical Library edition, ed. F. J. Miller, London, 1916.

² *Ibid.*, II, 193-94.

CHAUCER'S PHILIPPA, DAUGHTER OF PANNETO

The fragmentary household accounts of Elizabeth of Ulster for the years 1357-1359 mention gifts to and expenses of Chaucer and of, among others, a lady designated as Philippa Pan'¹ Her name appears in the records four times, in each instance being spelled in unexpanded form as Ph Pan'² The first name, written as Ph, unquestionably stands for *Philippa*, however, some real uncertainty has existed as to how the second name should be expanded. The early explanation in 1886 of Edward A. Bond is that Pan was "probably the contracted form of the word Panetaria—mistress of the pantry"³ The more recent opinion in 1926 of the late Professor John M. Manly is that Pan represented a family name and that as such it appears "in many forms Panetaria, de la Panetrie, Pentry, Panter, and the like"⁴ In this connection, one may point out that the will of John de Salkeld, proved January 20, 1358/9, includes another variant of this family name in mentioning a man called Thome de Panteri.⁵ But the contracted form of Pan may well represent some wholly different name, in fact, Manly himself cites a wealthy family in fourteenth-century England named Pantolf and says that "the abbreviation may as well stand for this name as for *panetaria*, and may well be a family name and not an official designation."⁶

To pursue a further possible identification of the name, the "mysterious lady who is designated as Philippa Pan'"⁷ may not be at all mysterious. Indeed, she may be no other person than Chaucer's wife Philippa, daughter of Paon, a knight from Roet, a small town in Hainaut. Early in the century, her father was rewarded for services in England, Kervyn de Lettenhove calling attention to the fact that "En 1332, un comte de la maison de la

¹ Edward A. Bond, *Life-Records of Chaucer* (Sec. Ser., 1886), xxi, 98-99.

² R. E. G. Kirk, *Life Records of Chaucer* (Sec. Ser., 1900), xxxii, 152-153.

³ Bond, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

⁴ John M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (New York, 1926), p. 62, see also Walter Rye, *London Athenæum* (January 29, 1881), pp. 166 ff.

⁵ R. S. Ferguson, *Testamenta Karleolensia* (1353-1386) (London, 1893), No. xix.

⁶ Manly, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁷ *Ibid.*

reine d'Angleterre mentionne un don fait à Panneto de Roed, de Hannonia" ⁸ The appearance in this record of the word Panneto (sometimes elsewhere spelled Paonnet or Paunet) suggests immediately the full form of the name abbreviated in the household accounts as Pan In other words, Philippa Pan' and Philippa, daughter of Panneto, obviously may be one and the same person This is both a natural and a satisfactory identification of Philippa Pan', thus Manly, apparently unaware of the spelling Panneto, had insufficient evidence for claiming that the "mysterious lady" was a person different from "that Philippa who at some time before 1366 became the poet's wife" ⁹

HALDEEN BRADY

Texas College of Mmes,
El Paso

A NOTE ON *THE MAN OF MODE*

In a chapter on Etherege in *The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy*, the author, Professor John Wilcox, concludes

no likeness between Molière and Etherege is close enough to prove that borrowing occurred Even if the possible borrowing in Etherege's last play [*The Man of Mode*] is conceded, there is still no sound evidence that *The Comical Revenge* or *She Would If She Could* was derived from Molière, nor even that Etherege had witnessed or read any of his plays before 1676 ¹

What Professor Wilcox and all previous writers on the subject have overlooked is a textual parallel between *The Man of Mode* and Molière's *Les Précieuses Ridicules* which proves quite conclusively that Etherege knew Molière's play and, in all probability, had it before him as he wrote his own comedy In Scene 11 of *Les Précieuses Ridicules* Mascarille calls to his "laquais" "Hola, Champagne, Picard, Bourguignon, Casquaret, Basque, la Verduze Lorrain, Provençal, la Violette" ² In Act III, scene 3, of *The Man of Mode* Sir Fopling Flutter calls his "equipage". "Hey,

⁸ Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Oeuvres de Froissart* (Brussels, 1877), xxiii, 28

⁹ Manly, *op cit*, p 57, see also p 63

¹ New York, Columbia University Press, 1938, p 81

² Despois, editor, *Oeuvres de Molière*, Paris, Hachette, 1875, II, 105

Champaine, Norman, La Rose, La Fleur, La Tour, La Verdu're!"³ Note that both start with an exclamation and the same name. Note also that the name "La Verdu're" occurs in both passages. Note further that Etherege's "La Rose" and "La Fleur" are suggested by Molière's "la Violette." Add to this that Molière's "Picard," "Bourguignon," "Basque," "Lorrain" and "Provençal" are names that stand for the inhabitant of a certain locale, and that Etherege's "Norman" does so too. And it is notable that when Sir Fopling must change the "barbarous" English name of John Troit borne by one of his equipage he rechristens him Hampshire, the name of the offender's county.⁴

It is in the light of these two passages that the similarities that others have noted between Sir Fopling Flutter and Mascarille become significant.⁵ I suggest also a similarity between Sir Fopling's finding fault with the "English motions" of one of his dancing servants and Mascarille's fault-finding with the time kept by the "violons" that play for his dancing,⁶ and between the aplomb shown by Mascarille when he is exposed and Sir Fopling's equally undisturbed fashion of reacting to Mrs. Lovett's rage when she turns on him.⁷ One might go on and suggest that Sir Fopling's song—of his own composition—may be an echo of Mascarille's "impromptu,"⁸ but enough resemblances have already been noted to warrant the belief that Etherege's Sir Fopling Flutter owes much to Molière's Mascarille.⁹

ARTHUR SHERBO

New York, N. Y.

³ Brett-Smith, editor, *The Dramatic Works of Sir George Etherege*, II 125-126, Oxford, 1927, II, 237.

⁴ *The Man of Mode*, III, 3, p. 242.

⁵ See Wilcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-81.

⁶ *The Man of Mode*, IV, 1, p. 254. *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, Sc. 12, p. 109.

⁷ *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, Sc. 16, p. 115. *The Man of Mode*, V, 2, p. 286.

⁸ *The Man of Mode*, IV, 2, p. 262. *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, Sc. 9, p. 84.

⁹ By 1676 *Les Précieuses Ridicules* was available in some eight editions. Etherege could have had access to the play in print, and although it can not be demonstrated, he might possibly have seen the play in performance in France. He might also have derived some ideas for Sir Fopling from Richard Flecknoe's unacted play, *The Damoselles à-la-Mode* (printed in 1667), a close adaptation of *Les Précieuses Ridicules*.

MILTON'S AID TO THE *POLYGLOTT BIBLE*

Masson suspected, because of a certain Council order, that Milton had brought before the Council of State a petition from Brian Walton for financial aid with the *Polyglott Bible*.¹ It may be that he had, but there is more certain evidence of aid to the great project by Milton. On July 9, 1653, the Council ordered, "on reading of a letter from Mr Milton to Sir G Pickering, that Pickering confer with the doctors mentioned as to what quantities of paper shall be imported free from duty, for carrying on the translation of the Bible."² As a result of this action the Council issued, on July 15th, a warrant to the Commissioners of Custom and Excise, "To permit Brune Ryves to import custom free 7,000 reams of paper, for the translation of the Bible into Oriental and learned tongues."³ Dr Brune Ryves, Dean of Chichester, was one of the eminent divines of the period. He and Walton, then, were probably the "doctors mentioned" by Milton. And Milton's letter to Pickering, now lost, must be counted among his few efforts to use his position to aid acquaintances.

In the preface to the great Bible Walton expressed gratitude to many who had helped him, among them "Brunus Ryvesius Decanus Cistrensis." Then, after a list of such important names, "*quibus aliisque omnibus qui labores nostros animis benevolis prosecuti sunt, gratitudinis vinculo mecum omnes qui aliquid utilitatis ex hac editione percepturi sunt obstricti tenentur*."⁴ It is ironic that this "we also thank" must cover the aid of John Milton, a great but blind linguist, his small contribution perhaps forgotten entirely.

W ARTHUR TURNER

Oberlin College

¹ David Masson, *The Life of John Milton* (London, 1859-1894), iv, 447. Walton had served as assistant to Reverend Stocke in Milton's boyhood parish.

² *CSPD*, 1653-64, p. 16. Pickering was then president of the Council. Masson (iv, 524) confused this with another proposed translation, and suggested Owen and Goodwin as the divines alluded to.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 428. There were additional grants later.

⁴ Brian Walton's preface, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (London, 1657), Tome I [Vol. 6], sig. C₂.

JAMES JOYCE'S EPIPHANIES

So far as I have been able to determine, no-one has remarked on the close coincidence between part of Joyce's account of his theory of epiphanies and an entry in a notebook of his, portions of which are dated 1904, a year during which he was writing *Stephen Hero*

This triviality made him think of Moments of spiritual life—Note-
collecting many such *moments* to book²
gether in a book of epiphanies By
an epiphany he meant a sudden
spiritual manifestation —*Stephen*
*Hero*¹

Significant of Joyce's continued appreciation of epiphanies is the following observation by Frank Budgen

In the course of many talks with Joyce in Zurich I found that for him human character was best displayed—I had almost said entirely displayed—in the commonest acts of life³

Cf *Stephen Hero* "The soul of the commonest object, the structure of which is so adjusted, seems to us radiant The object achieves its epiphany"⁴

Oliver St J Gogarty's remark that Joyce probably learned the meaning of *epiphany* as an aside in his Latin class⁵ must be regarded as no more than a guess It seems at least as likely that Joyce got his information from Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*, which the autobiographical Stephen "read . . . by the hour"⁶

JOSEPH PRESCOTT

Wayne University

¹ Ed Theodore Spencer (New York, 1944), p 211 Italics mine For the history of the composition of *Stephen Hero*, see *ibid*, pp 7-9

² Quoted by Herbert Gorman, *James Joyce* (New York and Toronto, 1939), p 136

³ *James Joyce and the Making of ULYSSES* (New York, 1934), p 74.

⁴ Page 213

⁵ *As I Was Going Down Sackville Street* (New York, 1937), p 295
Stephen Hero, p 26

BEOWULF 249 W^LITE = ICELANDIC LITR

When the coastguard of Hróþgar, the Danish king, expresses his sentiments in a speech at the arrival of the Geats on his shore, he has this to say about Beowulf

Næfre ic maran geseah
eorla ofer eorþan, ðonne is eower sum,
secg on searwum, nis þæt seldguma,
wæpnum geweorðað, næfne him his wite leoge,
ænlic ansyn

Never saw I a bigger (greater) man of earls on earth, than is one among you, a hero in harness, that is not a hall retainer, honored by his weapons, unless his appearance belie him, his unique looks

A fairly close parallel to this use of *white* 'looks, appearance,' is found in *Njáls saga* chapter 50. Gizurr hvíti is scrutinizing an ugly-looking customer, Skammkell, and remarks *eigi deilir litr kosti, ef þú gefst vel* 'looks do not reveal qualities, if you turn out well' This is obviously an old saying in Icelandic in which the original meaning of 'looks, appearance' still lingers, though the common meaning 'color' would also do reasonably well

STEFÁN EINARSSON

Johns Hopkins University

REVIEWS

George Eliot Her Life and Books By GERALD BULLETT. London: Collins, 1947. Pp 256 12s 6d.

This is by no means a definitive study of the life and work of George Eliot. Yet in its two hundred and fifty pages, Mr. Bullett succeeds in presenting to us a three-dimensional view of his subject. In swift and graphic strokes he sketches in George Eliot's life, actually compressing the first thirty years of that life into the first chapter. He proceeds to show Marian Evans as a journalist in London, as the companion of George Henry Lewes, and as a novelist. By the end of Chapter V, we have finished Part I, in Part II we are given three chapters, on "The Rustic Novels," "Invention versus Inspiration," and "Middlemarch." In three Appendices we find illustrative passages from George Eliot's translations from

Strauss and Feuerbach, and from Lewes' *Life of Goethe* and other writings. The total impression is one of balance, proper accent, critical objectivity combined with emotional insight. Writing as a novelist and a critic, Mr Bullett brings George Eliot out of the mists of Victorian scandal and idol-worshipping, into the light of the present. He knows the hazards of applying our new knowledge of psychology to one long dead, and in one of the finest passages in the book (p 156), concerned with George Eliot's state of mind after her marriage to John Walter Cross, he pauses and quietly says "I refrain from the impertinence of pretending to know her mind at that moment." On the other hand, equipped as he is with both the novelist's insight and the psychologist's knowledge, he can account for "the grey outlook" in her life as being "the result not of her opinions but of her unbuoyant temperament, the hidden psychological causes of which are now beyond our finding" (p 145). Thus we have in Mr Bullett's volume a splendid combination of narration and analysis. Readers will not soon forget the early pages on the Warwickshire background, the later pages on Marian Evans' life at 142 Strand and her work on the *Westminster Review*, and the letter (omitted by Cross) which she wrote to Charles Bray three months after leaving England with Lewes (pp 88-90). Nor will one forget the calm and telling analysis of her novels, especially of *Middlemarch*. Again we note the psychological insight when, in dealing with George Eliot's moral idealism, the author accounts for her voracious reading and her learning and her moralism as rooted in "a pathological self-dislike" (p 162).

British restrictions on paper are no doubt responsible for the brevity of this book, which in its general design would seem to suggest a work of much greater magnitude. Indeed, aside from a few misprints (pp 82, 121, etc.), one quarrels only about what is omitted. George Eliot's early essays, says Mr Bullett very truly, are "hard to come by" and thus "lavish quotation is legitimate" (p 73), but quotations from the essays are very fragmentary. Moreover, if excerpts from Strauss and Feuerbach can be given in Appendices, why cannot we have a substantial passage of the "gay anger" which one finds in George Eliot's famous satirical attack on the Evangelical spell-binder, Dr Cumming? Finally, why does the book end so abruptly with the termination of the chapter on *Middlemarch*? One answer is possible: the book falls into two Parts, the first an organic narrative actually ending with the word "dead," and the second a series of three studies of the novels. Even so, one is left with a sense of incompleteness. On the other hand, the work as a whole has not only artistic finish but also scholarly integrity. Mr Bullett has availed himself of the kindness of Professors Gordon S. Haight and Anna T. Kitchel, who have given him access to material not examined by previous biographers. He has also levied upon scholarly works in his field, upon Mr Haight's *George Eliot and John Chapman*, on Elizabeth S. Hal-

dane's *George Eliot and her Times*, on M P Bourl'honne's *George Eliot essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale*. It is gratifying to see a great Victorian figure treated with more than twentieth-century "fictionalizing." Mr Bullett makes Marian Evans stand before us, alive. But he also gives us the feeling that he has examined all of the facts. The result is that we have a compact, graphic, and living account, an excellent introduction to George Eliot for those who do not know her, or who mis-know her, and a memorable re-vivifying of her to those of us who have, for so many years, witnessed either attack or neglect when her name came into the discussion of great fiction.

CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD ¹

The Ohio State University

The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence. Edited by W S LEWIS, Volumes XIII and XIV. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Thomas Gray, Richard West, and Thomas Ashton*. Edited by W S LEWIS, GEORGE L LAM, and CHARLES H BENNETT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948. Pp lv + 250 + v + 315. Two volumes in one binding, \$20 00.

Of the large and varied company of Horace Walpole's friends who were recipients of his letters there is probably none who is so immediately interesting to the modern reader as Thomas Gray, and none who came so near to equalling him in mastery of the gracious art of the familiar letter. Richard West, who died of tuberculosis at the age of 26, is a charming figure in his own right and has also the romantic appeal of an "inheritor of unfulfilled renown." Thomas Ashton, not a winning or an admirable person, has at least the claim to our attention that he was the fourth member of the group of Eton schoolboys who called themselves the "quadruple alliance." It is probably the intrinsic interest of the persons concerned that explains why this element of Walpole's correspondence has already been so adequately edited that there was little left for the Yale editors to contribute.

Walpole's correspondence with his three schoolboy friends is here presented in a single chronological sequence. The earliest letter is one from Gray written in 1734. The correspondence with West ends with West's death in 1742. The latest letter from Ashton is dated in 1741. The correspondence with Gray was interrupted in 1738, first because he and Walpole were together during their travels on the Continent, and then because of their unhappy quar-

¹ We regret to report that C F Harrold died in July, 1948.—THE EDITORS

rel It was resumed in 1745 after the reconciliation and continues until Gray's death in 1771 The renewed correspondence with Gray fills the whole of the second of the two volumes of the Yale edition.

The correspondence with Gray includes 139 letters, of which 126 are from Gray and only 13 from Walpole The rest of Walpole's letters to Gray have been lost The correspondence with West consists of 39 letters, 20 from Walpole, 19 from West The correspondence with Ashton includes 5 letters, 3 from Walpole, 2 from Ashton The extant letters from Walpole to his three correspondents reach a total of only 36

One of the two letters from Ashton, a verse epistle in lively heroic couplets and frequently reminiscent of Pope, is here published for the first time It is printed from a photostat of Brit Mus Add MS 37,728 With this exception, the whole correspondence has for some years been available to scholars in very competent editions The 126 letters from Gray and the 13 from Walpole to Gray are accurately printed and fully annotated by Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley in *Correspondence of Thomas Gray*, 3 vols, Oxford, 1935 A comparison of several letters chosen at random shows no variants other than the superficial changes introduced into the Yale edition by its established policy of modernizing spelling and the use of capitals All of the letters here reproduced (except the verse-epistle from Ashton) are included among the 248 letters in Paget Townbee's *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West, and Ashton*, 2 vols, Oxford, 1915 The 36 letters of Walpole were accurately printed, but with slight annotation, by Mrs Toynbee in *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, 16 vols, Oxford, 1903-5. The annotations of the Yale editors are somewhat fuller than those of Toynbee-Whibley and a good deal fuller than those of Paget Toynbee Now and then they have been able to elucidate a reference that had baffled their predecessors

Beyond their primary contents, these volumes are also the vehicle for presenting some interesting items of Walpoliana, of which the most important is, on pages 3-51 of Volume XIII, a text with extremely generous annotations of Walpole's "Short Notes" of his life, newly printed from the original manuscript, now in Mr Lewis's possession In earlier printings of this document, including that in Mrs Toynbee's first volume, a number of sentences, amounting to about ten per cent of the whole, were omitted, apparently because they dealt with rather intimate personal matters Many of the restored passages, indicated by enclosing asterisks, are of considerable interest.

A detailed analytical index fills pages 261-315 of Volume XIV

ROBERT K. ROOT

Princeton University

The Poems of William Habington Edited with Introduction and Commentary by KENNETH ALLOTT London Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd (The University Press of Liverpool), 1948 Pp lxxviii + 208 15s

In this new edition of William Habington's poems, Mr Allott has produced a useful book for students of seventeenth century English literature. Since the first complete edition of *Castara* appeared, in 1640, four other editors have attempted to bring Habington to the attention of readers of poetry. Chalmers reprinted the 1640 edition in *The Works of the English Poets* (1810), Charles A. Elton reprinted it in 1812, with an introduction concerned more with Pope than with Habington, Southey included a reprint in *Select Works of the British Poets* (1831), and Edward Arber issued a faulty reprint with a brief introduction in 1870. Mr Allott has carefully collated the editions of 1634, 1635, and 1640, using as a basis for his text the edition of 1640. His extensive introduction throws new light on Habington and his poetry, and the notes to individual poems offer an excellent commentary.

The first part of *Castara* (1634), a pale imitation of the conventional Petrarchan sonnet sequence, reveals the author as a prudish young man whose passions are less strong than his self-righteousness. The second part (1635) asserts his happiness in marriage but more clearly relates his grief at the death of his closest friend, George Talbot. The third part (1640), containing perhaps the best poetry Habington wrote, is concerned largely with religious subjects, for the author has now rejected love poetry for higher themes.

Throughout his poems, Habington borrows freely from Donne (even more freely, I believe, than Mr. Allott has discovered), and echoes Horace, Juvenal, Propertius, and Claudian. Despite his claim to be a "son of Ben," he is less indebted to Jonson than to Donne.

Since the text of *Castara* presents few serious problems, the editor is chiefly concerned with Habington, about whom little is known, and with the many persons named in dedications or in the poems themselves. Habington was a Catholic with a strong Puritan bias. His poems appeared during a time when restrictions against Catholics had been relaxed somewhat. In the Habington family, these restrictions had been felt heavily, for the poet's father, Thomas, had been implicated in Babington's Plot and the Gunpowder Plot. Hindlip Hall, the family residence in Worcester, was provided with secret hiding places for priests, two of whom were captured with two lay-brothers after a siege in January, 1606. Thomas Habington escaped with his life because of strong connections at court, but he was fined heavily and his property was confiscated. William

Habington was educated at St Omer by the Jesuits and returned home to live among his Catholic family and friends. His poems naturally reflect Catholic beliefs and opinions and are addressed usually to people who shared his faith. In his notes, Mr Allott has identified many of these people, most of whom are indicated in *Castara* only by initials.

Mr Allott's edition of Habington is likely to remain the standard edition for a long time, for it is a product of sound scholarship, as nearly complete as careful research can make it.

HOMER C COMBS

Washington University

Der italienische Humanismus Von EUGENIO GARIN, Bern, A Francke, 1947 Pp 296.

There is undoubtedly room for a book which will set forth the historical development of Italian humanism and assess its achievement in the recovery of our knowledge of antiquity as compared with previous attempts in the Middle Ages. Such a book could evaluate the contribution of Italian humanism to the intellectual history of the Western world, which has been so much discussed (especially in this country) during recent years. And there is also room for an account of Italian humanism in its purely literary aspect, its literary production both in ancient languages and in the vernacular.

Dr Garin's book is both wider and narrower in its scope. It is wider in its chronological limits, as it covers "the development of Italian thought" from the age of humanism down to the beginning of the seventeenth century, and it is narrower because it does not aim to describe the recovery of ancient literature or the process of its investigation, with all the consequences in the realms of philology, literary criticism and historical knowledge in the widest sense, which may be considered the most valuable contribution made by the humanists to culture. Indeed, it apparently excludes some, or most of these things, as "purely grammatical discussions" of no interest (p 74). Its professed subject is "Italian thought," including under this very general term pure philosophy (the book ends with a chapter on Bruno and Campanella), with special reference to certain problems connected with ethics, such as the relative value of the contemplative and the active life, and the duty of "civil life." To this end the book brings in a number of lesser known figures and discussions, with useful and suggestive quotations from unpublished MSS.

To some extent this book reflects the puzzlement of some Italian scholars who, after being subjected to the rigours of authoritarian-

ism in both State and Church, suddenly found themselves, after the war, in a free world. In a previous work, *Il rinascimento italiano*, published under the auspices of a Fascist institution (Milan, "Istituto per gli studi di politica internazionale," 1941), Dr. Garin had made the Renaissance begin with Cola di Rienzo's attempt to revive Roman imperialism. The first section of the book (pp. 21-37) is entirely devoted to the Cola episode, and Petrarch comes in as his admirer and disciple who abandons his former republican ideals for the sake of "romanità." But in a later article, published this time under the pious auspices of the neo-Catholic Giovanni Papini, Dr. Garin made the discovery that the Renaissance was essentially religious and Christian.¹ Now, in 1947, Dr. Garin finds that humanism has a "social character" (p. 13) and is interested in "civil life" (*bürgerisches Leben*) so the book begins with Petrarch as a moral teacher, while Cola di Rienzo is reduced to a brief and unfavourable mention on page 14. No reference is made to the Roman Empire, and Cola's aim becomes the "*renovatio*" der "*sacra Italia*." It is admitted that Petrarch admired Caesar, but only as a model of "*vollendete Menschlichkeit*" (*ibidem*).

The book was translated into German "nach dem Manuskript" by Dr. Giuseppe Zamboni.

NAPOLEONE ORSINI

Duke University

Essays in Retrospect. Collected Articles and Addresses. By CHAUNCEY BREWSTER TINKER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948. Pp. iv + 161.

Set beside the careful "studies" of a lifetime, the articles and addresses Tinker has collected as *Essays in Retrospect* are occasional and seemingly casual. Yet "to conceive of his opinions as casual is to forget his scholarship and his long experience with literature as a force in men's lives." These are Tinker's own words about Johnson, and they must be any reader's about Tinker. Whether in essays such as these, or speech across the lunch table or the hearth-rug, all that is said or written by the man is vital and has the truth of vitality nourished on learning and both refreshed and tested by a long experience of the arts as a force in men's lives. Here we have the scholar working as teacher, the critic showing as guide and counsellor. Here are wit and wisdom; here the shared delight in bringing ideas and attitudes out of the past into the present that they may foster man's humanity and charity in the future.

¹ "Il Rinascimento non solo non fu pagano, ma fu anche, nella massima parte, profondamente e sinceramente cristiano" see his article, *Giovanni Gentile interprete del Rinascimento*, in *La Rinascente*, Vol. VII, No. 35, January-June 1944, p. 69.

However benefitted by those other disciplines of learning, scholarship, and criticism, this is the book of Chauncey B Tinker. In it the contemporary and colloquial jostle the literary and the well-tried. Thucydides and Fanny Burney, Pepys and Horace, Thermopylae and the Boston and Maine Railroad, the Ospedale del Ceppo at Pistoja and a dentist's assistant, suggest the scope, indicate the variety. The foolishness of Trollope, the sillinesses of the Pre-raphaelites, the weakness of Housman in not actually destroying the poems he held from publication are foils and balance for a radiant love of human beings, a love of color and line and passion in the age of brick and gas, a unique power to stab the heart with the sudden and unforgettable word. Nurses are addressed on *The Seven Works of Mercy*, corporal and spiritual, graduates of the School of Fine Arts on craftsmanship in the service of the spirit. The origin of all things, in art and biology, is reviewed for the solution of the problem that every man is to himself. Since all this matters, since perhaps this is all that matters, always as he speaks or writes Tinker is enjoying himself. Is not that the secret of his art as teacher? Was it not thus that he rose, is it not so that he persists in the minds of all?

So it seems, not least because every sentence in this book carries the accent and the intonation of a personality.

B H LEHMAN

University of California, Berkeley

French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland By MARIO PEI
New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. xiv + 105.

In the Introduction to his work, Professor Pei states that many scholars interested in the origin of the OF epic have disregarded the important rôle played by the earlier religious poetry, and that no scholar has offered "systematically arranged" evidence of the influence of this poetry on the creation of the epic. It is, accordingly, his intention to establish a (syntactical, lexical, stylistic, literary, philosophical) comparison between the *Eulalie*, *Léger*, *Passion*, *Alexis*, on the one hand, and the *Roland* on the other, in order to "prove the existence of a literary current capable of turning from a purely religious into a religious-epic channel . . ." Moreover, in the text of his work, he seeks to show, by means of statistics, that the same stylistic (etc.) features present in the first religious works increase in frequency, from poem to poem, to reach their fullest expansion in the *Roland*. Thus his 'literary current' is envisaged as an all-powerful force which, gaining momentum in the course of more than two centuries, passing from one 'channel' to another, finally produces the crest-wave of the *Roland*.

What is the nature of this dynamic current? There are a few features that might, perhaps, be termed 'philosophical' ("Wealth and Earthly Honors," "Virginity and Chastity" etc.), which are sometimes curiously interpreted (we are told that in *Al* "poverty is blamed" [p. 74], but it is blamed by Eufemien, consistently purblind to spiritual values!), and which are noted in a call-the-roll fashion, moreover, along with such concepts we find in the same chapter (iv) such miscellaneous themes as "Outward Manifestations of Grief," "Sea Voyage," "The Assumption," "Entrusting of Objects," "Arrival on Death Scene." The first three chapters, though less incoherent, may prove equally disappointing to anyone interested in the literary origins of the epic. Chapter I ("Versification") contains some 40 lines of text, with more than 30 lines of bibliographical references. Chapter II lists almost 50 [types of] expressions found in the *Roland* which are also attested earlier; we learn that *jusque, par nulle guise, prendre congé, morz est, c'est merveille* appear in both *Al* and *Rol* (to say nothing of *e' gentils hom*, which fact represents to Pei a "striking similarity" [p. 19]), we are also told that while 'transition from day to night' is mentioned in both epic and religious poetry, it is only in epic poetry that we also find 'transition from night to day'. In Chapter III there are listed examples of 13 stylistic and literary devices, from chiasm and apposition to scene-shifting.

It is to be debated whether or not a 'literary current' can ever explain what is most important about any given work of art, but I should say that, in the accumulation of features here offered us, we feel the movement of *no* current, only the presence of a mass of unrelated details—as inert as the stones with which a cathedral may (or may not) be built. Surely, before the *Roland*, the French language existed, and had served as the medium of narrative poetry. But to elaborate a *sine qua non* is not to offer an explanation.

Thus I am unable to see what Professor Pei's statistics serve to prove about the *Roland*. As for the accuracy of the statistics in themselves, I may say only that I have checked on two points which seemed immediately questionable to me—with the following results:

p. 11 Pei states that the type 'when he sees [hears]' is lacking in *Pass* and *Leg* (and *Eul*). To the contrary, there are at least 8 examples in each: *Pass* 33, 49, 50, 77, 123, 133, 209, 241, 397, and *Leg* 42, 85, 90, 149, 187, 189, 205, 217. This rather surprising discrepancy is to be explained by the fact that Pei overlooked the conjunction *cum*—which in the earlier language was much more frequent than *quand*.

p. 15 We are told that *Al* contains no similes. Actually, there are at least 3 (143, 149, 423—and perhaps 321). Similarly Pei has miscounted the similes in *Pass*. He notes only 2 (395-6, 475-6), I have found 5 (including 127-8, 156, 163). This discrepancy I am unable to explain.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence Sterne By ERNEST NEVIN DILWORTH New York King's Crown Press, 1948
Pp xiv + 115 \$2 25

An argument concerning whether or not Sterne is sentimental may seem perilously like the well-worn one about Hamlet's madness. An ultimate equivocation is hardly to be resolved by anything short of a straddling answer. But Mr Dilworth in his vigorous and entertaining essay has not straddled. He has argued ably, and he has used admirable logical and critical powers to prove that Sterne was a jester first, last, and always and that he has been regarded as "prince of sentimentalists" only through perverse misapprehension of his purpose.

The method of the book is so sound that the thesis *ought* to win immediately acceptance. The author has struggled honestly and intelligently with definition, and he has examined with care and insight the passages in *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey* that have long been regarded as the *loci classici* of Sterne's sentimentalism. He has, moreover, sought to bring the biography of Sterne and the sermons, journals, and letters to bear on the main argument. Point by point the argument seems convincing. As an antidote to extremists who harp on Sterne's "lacrymose divagations," it is of real value. But difficulties arise with the argument as a whole, and if it is not finally successful, the reason is that it implies an oversimplification of a complex problem.

It is demonstrable that Sterne persistently parodied and satirized "the sentimental fashion of his day," but one must also account for the part that he played in setting that fashion. Moreover, one must not forget, as Mr Dilworth apparently does, that Sterne could delight in the very things he ridiculed and that the kindness of his satire often transmutes it into something tantalizingly *like* sentimentality—if not, indeed, into the real article. In short, one may still ask whether the jester must inevitably be divorced from the "man of feeling." Furthermore, one would like some answer to recent defenders of Sterne's seriousness of purpose like Mr Herbert Read and Mr W. B. C. Watkins, critics whom Mr Dilworth most regrettably shows no signs of having read. (Since German critics were not neglected, it is also regrettable that Rudolf Maack's pertinent study was not considered.)

At one point the author poses the question, "Was Sterne deeply moved by nothing?" His evasion of an answer is easier than it is fair. The final summation that "to Sterne everything is words" does not meet all the issues. Once again logic has failed to explain an elusive genius.

LODWICK HARTLEY

North Carolina State College

This Great Stage. Image and Structure in King Lear By ROBERT B HEILMAN Baton Rouge Louisiana State University Press, 1948 Pp xi + 339 \$3 50

After presenting thirty-eight pages of prolegomena on the methods and merits of the "new criticism," Professor Heilman collects from the text of *King Lear* recurrent words and images in an attempt to demonstrate the existence, architectonic, and meaning of a clothes pattern, a sight pattern, a madness pattern, a nature pattern, an animal pattern, and the like His purpose is to display the tragedy as a seamless fabric, harmonious as art and weatherproof as philosophy.

The author's own ethical and religious position is one toward which many of us feel loyalty, and his sincerity as a critic is beyond question, but when he writes, p 179, that

The clothes, nature, animal, age, and justice patterns present the complex world that is to be understood, the sight and madness patterns (of which the values pattern is an auxiliary) are concerned with the process and method of understanding and coming to terms with that complex world,

and goes on in this way for hundreds of pages, the effect is precisely the effect of some very "old criticism" produced by scholiasts poring over texts in order to delimit protasis, epitasis, catatasis, and catastrophe *King Lear* alters before our eyes from a beautiful and moving play into a treatise written in code, and pretty much of a bore When Lear, suffering and about to die, humbly asks and gratefully acknowledges a small service, we are indeed taken into the "heart of the tragedy."

Pray you undo this button Thank you, sir

Who now can smugly rejoice that the old man has achieved humility, has soldered up his "flaw"? Professor Heilman, p. 83, cannot dwell on the *Pray you* and *Trank you, sir* (mere pathos) because he has established a clothes pattern, buttons are an appurtenance of clothes, and he must keep his eye on the button

Lear makes his last command, a very mild one, yet it takes us into the heart of the tragedy For his words take us back to the *divest* of Act I, when he was preparing casually for retirement, for ease before the final sleep, to the frantic *unbutton here* of Act III, when he was attempting to make physical fact conform to the spiritual unprotectedness which he had brought about by his earlier disrobing, and to the *pull off my boots* of Act IV, when the fiercest travel in the hard world was over, and they tell us of a final freeing from clothes that can be followed by no new agony

Whether or not this is neat, neatly it destroys the play, reducing its mountains to molehills

The new critics are men in search of a faith turning to poetry as their sacred writ Only their co-religionists can discuss their work wholly without embarrassment The reviewer could point to numerous instances in which Professor Heilman seems inadequately aware of the malleable quality of Elizabethan English and of

Shakespeare's resourcefulness in using it, but such comment would be pointless. Although the author honestly believes that his explanation grows out of the language of the play, actually it does not. *This Great Stage* is an expression of faith, and perhaps should be judged purely on the basis of its piety of intention as perceived by kindred spirits.

ALFRED HARBAGE

Columbia University

BRIEF MENTION

History of Early Russian Literature By N K GUDZY, tr by SUSAN WILBUR JONES. Introduction by GLEB STRUVE. New York Macmillan, 1949 Pp xxii + 545 \$10 00 This is one of the books selected for translation by an A C L S committee in order to "provide an insight into Russian life and thought" It is a survey by a specialist of his country's literature from its beginnings in the eleventh century to the end of the seventeenth. He points out the extensive influence of Byzantium, of the Russian church, and, after the collapse of the civilization that developed around Kiev, of the Moscow autocracy with its effort towards unity and towards making of the city the "third Rome" Stress is, of course, laid on the *Tale of Igor's Expedition*, of which the recent translation and study by Grégoire, Jakobson, and others (cf. *MLN.*, LXIII, 502-3) might have been mentioned by Miss Jones Other high points are the correspondence between Ivan the Terrible and Prince Kurbsky, the writings of the passionate Archpriest Avvakum, the *Life of Juliana Lazarevskaya* the heroine of which was so holy that she put hazelnut shells in her shoes and refrained from bathing, and the amusing tale of *Karp Sutolov and His Prudent Wife* The translator has followed the author even when he relates, for the instruction of his Russian readers, the story of Solomon's judgment, or when he remarks (p 248) that Shem was "one of the son's of Noah," or when he makes no comment on the alleged use of cannon against Kiev in 1240 (p 210). The omission of the article in "became model" (p 248) is Russian, not English. "Carthage" for "Carthage" (p. 228) is due to the translator's misunderstanding of the Russian name for the city She has produced, however, a readable book, one that will enlighten many. The frankness of Professor Godzy, who makes no effort to conceal the poverty of Russian literature before 1700, in comparison with that of western Europe, is impressive I wonder whether his freedom to speak his mind is made possible by the fact that the "Marxist-Leninist study of early Russian literature is as yet in the embryonic stage" (p 21).

H CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies Edited by J. G. McMANAWAY, G. E. DAWSON, and E. E. WILLOUGHBY. Washington, D. C. The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948. Pp. x + 808. \$10.00. Professor Adams' associates at the Folger Library have faithfully and devotedly memorialized him in this splendidly printed and immensely interesting volume. The table of contents is an impressive roster of all those who really count in the study of Renaissance literature, and the very fact that so many distinguished men could be persuaded to contribute is a fine testimonial to the esteem in which Professor Adams was held. As a consequence, this volume, unlike others of the same nature, is uniform in subject and is unmarred by the *disjecta membra* with which books of its type are usually cluttered. The fifty-odd papers, though varying widely in importance and prose style, provide the reader with a considerable amount of new information and with excellent examples of the various forms of research exercises now practised by students of Elizabethan letters. The book could easily be used as a text in a course in research methodology. From the prefatory bibliography, we also learn that Professor Adams wrote upward of fifty papers himself and that these papers now are scattered through a variety of journals, we can hope that the editors of this volume are now engaged in bringing them together in one volume. This would be a final service to a great master.

D. C. A.

Seven Satires (1598) By WILLIAM RANKINS. Edited by A. DAVENPORT. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1948. Pp. ix + 57. 3/6. This inexpensive but careful reprint of a little-known work is the first of a series of editions of Elizabethan satirists being put out by the University of Liverpool Press. Though Rankins as a poet may be classified as generally competent but seldom exciting, his seven satires have an interesting organization around the days of the week. Monday is devoted to fickle persons born under the influence of the moon, Tuesday to the belligerent braggarts influenced by Mars, etc. Besides the seven satires, which give the book its title, the volume contains several mildly intellectualized religious poems and a social satire, "Satyrus Peregrinus," which attacks, after the usual fashion, the sharp business practices and the social ambitions of the middle class. Anyone interested in Elizabethan satire should find the book useful. Even those cautious persons who may be unwilling to go so far as Mr. Davenport in seeing in the *Seven Satires* a link between the usual

Juvenalian satire of Hall or Marston and the satire of humors of Jonson can still be grateful for the painstaking work which has made possible this attractive edition.

AUDREY CHEW

Mills College

Unesco Book Coupons To enable those who live in "soft" currency countries to purchase books and periodicals published in countries of "hard" currency Unesco has provided until the end of 1949 coupons that can be obtained in the United Kingdom, France, India, China, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. The Unesco authorities hope that the privilege can soon be extended to all member countries. For detailed information about these coupons address the Direction des Bibliothèques de France, 53 rue St-Dominique, Paris (7°), the Ministry of National Education, Government of India, New Delhi, or Unesco Book Coupons, Tokens Ltd, 28 Little Russell St, London W C 1—THE EDITORS

Comparative Literature. MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES extends its cordial greetings to *Comparative Literature*, a quarterly journal published at the University of Oregon under the editorship of Professor Chandler B. Beall. Professor W. P. Friederich is associate editor. The first number contains articles by Professors Wellek, Curtius, Baldensperger, and other scholars. Contributors and subscribers should address University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Ore. Subscription for a year is \$3.50—THE EDITORS.

New Complete English-Russian Dictionary by LOUIS SEGAL. New York: Hafner, 1948. Pp. xviii + 1111. If not complete in the sense of the Oxford, this is a remarkably ample dictionary, including technical terms (spark-plug, pancake-landing) and a number of proper nouns (Arkansas, pronounced in European fashion Арканзас). It will be most helpful to the many students who would write and speak the Russian language.—H. C. L.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

JUNE, 1949

Number 6

WIELANDS BRIEFWECHSEL MIT DU VAU

Auguste Du Vau, geboren in Tours am 14 Januar 1771 als Sohn eines leitenden Finanzbeamten, fluchtete bald nach Ausbruch der Revolution nach Deutschland. Er verbrachte die Jahre 1795-1801 hauptsächlich in Weimar, wo er u. a. mit Bottiger, Knebel, und Wieland befreundet wurde.¹ Du Vau entschloß sich, Wielands *Neue Gottergespräche* ins Französische zu übersetzen, und diese Unternehmung gab Anlaß zu dem hier mitgeteilten Briefwechsel. Samtliche Briefe befinden sich in meinem Besitz. Die jedem Briefe vorgesetzte Nummer verweist auf die *Prolegomena*² Bernhard Seufferts, dem ich von Zeit zu Zeit meine Neuerwerbungen mitteilte.

Prol 3618 [6 Nov 1795 oder 8 Tage früher]

Werthester Herr Hofrath,

Ich bin nun einmahl daran gewohnt, daß Sie selbst meine (*gestrichen*) bestimmen was ich von meinen eigenen Arbeiten halten soll, und finde mich immer am besten dabey, wenn ich ihren Meynungen und Anweisungen getreu bleibe—Gewisse Personen haben schon meine Uebersetzung gelesen, und eine besonders soll bedauert haben, daß sie nicht so gut gerathen war als man es von mir erwarten konnte. Weil ich doch gern wissen mochte, wie ich daran bin, ob (*gestrichen*) und ob sie schlecht, mittelmäßig oder gut ist, so bitte ich mir gehorsamst ihre gutige Meynung darüber aus Sie dürfen mir nur ein S ein M oder ein G schreiben, dann weiß ich gleich was es heißen soll. Sind Sie damit zufrieden, so will ich nicht sublimare genere sidera vertite,³ wie der Freund Flaccus. Aber ich bekomme

¹ S. den Aufsatz über Du Vau von Friedrich Michael, *Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kppenberg* IV, 191-248 (1924), ferner Charles Jorets Aufsatz in der *Revue germanique* III, 501-555 (1907).

² *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland Ausgabe IX, Briefwechsel 2. Hälfte 1791-1812* verzeichnet von Bernhard Seuffert in Graz. Unter Mitwirkung von Dr. Margaret Seuffert, Berlin 1941 (*Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Jgg. 1940 Phil.-hist. Klasse Nr. 15*).

³ vgl. Horaz, *Carm.* I 1 36: *sublimi feriam sidera vertice*.

mich um das Urtheil anderer nicht mehr — Das Original brauche ich Ihnen wohl nicht zu schicken, denn ich habe mir einige nothige Veränderungen erlaubt, und mein Endzweck wird doch erreicht, wenn nur das Französische gut ist Zunkel selbst will den Anfang etwas abkurzen

Ihr ganz gehorsamster Diener

Du Vau

Donnerstag früh

[Am obern Rande] Ich habe schon Zeit gehabt den Anfang zu (*gestrichen*) nach Zunkel selbst zu verändern —

Quartblatt 19 x 23 cm groß, Wasserzeichen *C & L I Homg.* Nur die eine Hälfte des Blattes ist beschrieben Auf der Rückseite der andern Hälfte steht Wielands Antwort, Prol 3620

Prol 3619 [vor 7 Nov 1795]

Mr Du Vau est prie de vouloir bien à la premiere fois qu'il me fera l'honneur de me voir, apporter avec lui l'Original des *Gottergesprache* Nous nous mettrons alors ensemble à comparer la traduction à l'Original

Les petites poesies sont charmantes et prouvent un talent décide pour ce genre

W

Mit Bleistift geschrieben Oktavzettel, 11½ x 19 cm Wasserzeichen *Homg*

Prol 3620 [vor 7 Nov 1795].

Votre traduction, mon cher Chevalier, me paroît ni bonne ni mauvaise, mais faite un peu à la hâte et pas assez soignée pour être présentée au Public françois, telle qu'elle est Je vous conseille donc de la retoucher, d'être un peu plus severe envers Vous même, et surtout de changer les passages que j'ai marques dans Votre Manuscript Une petite brochure, comme celle là, doit, comme une mignature, etre sans defect et finie au dernier point On passe dans un grand ouvrage un moment de sommeil à Homere mais à Vous, mon cher Ami, on ne passera pas la moindre petite negligence dans un si petit ouvrage et on aura raison Excusez la franchise de l'amitié et soyez bien persuadé de mes sentimens pour Vous Adieu,

W.

Quartblatt vgl. Prol 3618

Prol 3621 7 November 1795

Anschrift mit erhaltenem Siegel ruckseitig pour Monsieur le Chevalier Du Vau

Je suis bien fache, mon cher Chevalier, d'être obligé de me priver cet apres midi du plaisir de Vous voir et de continuer avec Vous la lecture de votre traduction des Dial d Dieux Ce sera donc pour demain, à notre heure ordinaire, en cas que Vous n'etes pas engage autrement Adieu mon aimable jeune Ami

S a V

W

ce 7^{me} Novembre 95

Oktavzettel 11½ x 19 cm. Wasserzeichen *Kool*

Prol 3651 [Weimar, 1796]

Meine Augen und meine Brust befinden sich heute schlechter als gestern, und überhaupt ist es kaum möglich in einer unpoetischen Laune zu seyn als ich bin In solchen Umständen war' es Verwegenheit über Ihre Verse, die ich kaum *lesen* kann, urtheilen zu wollen Ich habe sie indessen doch gelesen und glaube Sie haben auf keine Weise zu befürchten daß sie nicht sehr gut aufgenommen werden sollten, da sie *sogar mir* gefallen, der gerade in keiner gunstigen Stimmung ist, sich irgend etwas gefallen zu lassen

Einen Vers, den ich mit Reißbley angezeichnet habe, verstehe ich nicht und muthmaße einen *Schreibfehler* auf Ihrer oder einen *Lesefehler* auf meiner Seite, denn ich lese *trouveres grace*—Vermuthlich wollten Sie *trouvera* schreiben, und so ist auch mein Skiupel auf einmahl gehoben Leben Sie wohl, Lieber! Diesen Abend sollte ich in Ihrer Gesellschaft bey der Herzogin-Mutter zubringen, ich habe mich aber entschuldigen müssen Ich kann in der That nicht ausgehen ohne mein Seelengehause, das bereits einem Spinnengewebe gleicht, einer ganzlichen Zerruttung auszusetzen Ich dachte bisher ich wollte versuchen, ob die liebe Natur nicht ohne Hülfe der Askulapischen Kunst zu meiner Herstellung hinreichen würde—aber die Madre Natura m' a tradita, und ich werde am Ende doch noch Pulver schlucken oder Trankchen schlurfen müssen *Voilà les fruits de l' age*—also,

freut Euch des Lebens

weil noch das Lampchen glüht! ⁴

und adieu!

W

P S Noch bemerke ich im 3^{ten} Verse (wenn Sie von hinten zu zählen anfangen) ein *tant*, das mir im Wege ist *sans tant de mystere*—*tant* scheint mir ein relatives Wortchen zu seyn, es mußte also in den vorgehenden

⁴ Dieses Lied war 1793 von Usteri gedichtet, 1795 von Nagel vertont worden

Versen eine hinlangliche Ursache seyn, worauf sich das *sans (faire) tant de mystere* bezoge — ich finde das aber nicht — *C'est une minutie — et vous pouvez etre sur, que personne ne s'en appercevra pas*

Oktavblatt 11 x 19 cm Wasserzeichen nicht bestimmbar.

Prol 3652 [1796]

Anschrift mit erhaltenem Siegel ruckseitig A Monsieur Le Chevalier Du Vau

Wenn Sie, 1 Hr Chevalier, wichtige Anmerkungen uber einige Veranderungen in Ihrer Uebersetzung der Dialogues des Dieux zu machen haben, so muß dies auf alle Falle schriftlich geschehen damit der nothige Gebrauch davon gemacht werden kann Haben Sie also die Gute Ihre Anmerkungen vor allen Dingen zu Papier zu bringen und mir selbige dann morgen oder ubermorgen Nachmittags zu uberbringen, oder sonst zuzuschicken Heute bin ich, zu meinem Bedauern, verhindert, Sie bey mir zu sehen Leben Sie indessen wohl

W

Oktavblatt 11 x 18 5 cm Wasserzeichen unbestimmbar

Prol. 3657 6 Jan 1796

Mon cher Chevalier,

je vous envoie

- 1) Les Abderites 2 vol
- 2) les Romans de Voltaire, Deuxieme Volume
- 3) le 1 Vol des Mille et une Nuits

Je ferai chercher les autres livres que Vous demandez La lettre pour Mr de Dalberg, que je vous fais remettre, doit partir Vendredi passé et a été oubliée Voudriez Vous bien avoir la complaisance de Vous en charger?

Pour ce qui est du *Duft*, vous ferez bien de vous tenir à la chose, sans vous trop asservir à l'expression allemande, qui ne sauroit pas etre rendue en françois litteralement C'est une baggatelle, qui ne vaut pas la peine sich den Kopf daruber zu zerbrechen Adieu, bon voyage!

W

Zettel 10½ x 17½ cm. Wasserzeichen unbestimmbar

Prol 3661 6 Jan. 1796

Anschrift mit erhaltenem Siegel ruckseitig pour Mr le Chevalier Du Vau avec une brochure françoise No. 46.

Laissez-là s'il Vous plait le cher *Schlangenwurmer*, Mr le Chevalier, et epargnez Vous à Vous et moi le ridicule d'une note sur une pareille niaiserie Pour Vous mettre à couvert de toute chicane de la part des Zoiles, je ne manquerai pas de faire main basse sur le dit *Schlangenwurmer* à la première edition qui se fera des *Gottergesprache*.

Je Vous envoie tout ce que j'ai encor des brochures de Mr Chanoumier, Dieu sait si quelque chose y manque encore Au pis aller il faudra bien que Mr Chanoumier prenne un peu de patience, car comme rien ne se perd absolument dans la Nature, il faudra bien que ce qui manque se retrouve—ou chez Mr de Knebel ou chez Mr Herder, quoique je ne me souvienn pas trop bien, si c'est à l'un ou à l'autre que j'ai prêté le recit de l'Insurrection du ^{me} du *Vendemiaire* Enfin, si cette dernière piece Vous manque, faites en bien mes excuses à Mr Ch et assurez-le bien que je ferai l'impossible pour la restituer en peu de jours Bon soir, mon cher Duvau

ce 6 Jan 96

W

Prol. 3690 Datum von Du Vau beigesetzt 17^{ten} Febr 96.

Ich beklage, 1 Chevalier, daß ich verhindert bin, Sie diesen Nachmittag zu sehen Künftigen Sonnabend wird es um so gewisser geschehen Leben Sie wohl und sehen Sie fleissiger in den goldnen Spiegel, als in die schonen Augen Ihrer Lise — Emilie

W

17^{ten} Feb 96

Zettel 10 x 11½ cm

Prol. 3735 13 Mai, 1796.

Hier, lieber Chevalier, 15 Louis als ein kleines Honorar für Ihre Übersetzung der Göttergespräche Sie erinnern Sich ohne Zweifel, daß Geßner (dem die Schwierigkeiten und Gefahren des dermaligen Buchhandels in Frankreich nur gar zu wohl bekannt sind) sich zu nichts weiter anheischig gemacht hat, als mit den Dialogues des Dieux *einen Versuch* zu machen Gelingt es nur einigermaßen, das ist, nur in so weit daß kein Verlust für ihn heraus kommt, so wird er, aus gutem Willen zu Ihnen und mir, auch mit dem Miroir d'Or⁵ fortfahren, und versteht sich ebenfalls zu einem Honorar von 15 Louis für jedes folgende Bandchen Sollte die Entreprise gut von Statten gehen, so kann und wird er noch mehr thun, denn er ist ein edelgesinnter Mann Für itzt, Mein lieber junger Freund, nehmen Sie vorlieb, und leben Sie wohl Sollten Sie heute nach Belvedere spazieren gehen, so kommen Sie vorher einen Augenblick zu mir Ich kann Hr'n Mournier heute nicht besuchen

W

Am Rande Unter die beyliegende Quittung schreiben Sie Ihren Tauf und Geschlechtsnahmen, und geben Sie meinem Sohn zurück

Datum von Du Vau 13^{ten} Apr (*gestrichen*) May 96

Zettel 11½ x 18½ cm.

⁵ Nach dem "Avis du traducteur" der *Dialogues des Dieux* arbeitete Du Vau an der Übersetzung des *Goldnen Spiegels*, "traduction qui paraîtra bientôt après celle des *Dialogues des Dieux*, elle sera suivie de celle des

Prol 3771 24 Aug 1796.

Hr Gessner in Zurich wunscht das Mscpt zum 2^{ten} Bandchen der Oeuvres choisies de Wieland so bald als moglich von Hin Du Vau durch den Postwagen zu erhalten, und hat zugleich die Ehre denselben seiner Hochachtung und Ergebenheit zu versichern

W
24^{ten}8

Anschrift mit erhaltenem Siegel ruckseitig A Monsieur le Chevalier Du Vau

Quartblatt 18 x 22 cm Wasserzeichen mit einer Krone

Datum von anderer Hand konnte auch als Oct gelesen werden

Prol. 3798 [Mehrere Tage vor 20. Okt. 1796]

In diesem Augenblick, lieber Herr Chevalier erhalte ich die hiebey folgende 12 Exemplare des Vol 1 der Oeuvres choisies^o

Ich werde dafür sorgen, daß Sie noch 8 derselben baldmöglichst bekommen
L 8 W

W

Ruckwärts

An Herrn Chevalier Du Vau
nebst einem Packchen Bucher

Zettel 18½ x 11 cm.

Prol 3799 Du Vau an Wieland, 20 October 1796

S 308 *avant qu'un seul peuple J'en sois avité—J'en fus avité*, muß es seyn

4 tens Druckfehler

Ich fuhre nur hier und da die auffallendsten an

S 24—*entre vous et moi—entre toi et moi*

S 41 *avait aux yeux un autre droit, bien que le fils—avait bien aux yeux un autre droit que—*

Abdértes, de Danuschmend, d'Agathon et de ceux des ouvrages en prose de M Wieland qui nous ont paru se rapprocher le plus du goût et du caractère de la nation française (Revue germanique III, 516 f)

^o Das Werk ist mir unzugänglich Der Katalog der Bibliothèque Nationale zitiert Wieland (Christoph Martin) Œuvres choisies, Trad par August Duvau Zurich, 1796 Wieland (Christoph Martin) Dialogues des dieux Trad par August Duvau Zurich, 1796 (Même ouvrage que le précédent)

Nach Charles Joret (Revue germanique III, 516) lautete der Titel Dialogue [''] des Dieux, de M. Wieland, traduits de l'allemand par L C D V (Le Chevalier Du Vau), à Zurich, chez H. Gessner, 1796, in 8 Dialogue ist Druckfehler, an andern Stellen hat Joret Dialogues

S 67 *il croyoit me gouverner, et c'étoit moi qui le gouverna — qui le gouvernois —*

S 142 *a tel autel objet—a tel ou tel objet*

S 244 *la démocratie en la plus mauvaise (le gouvernement—le plus mauvais*

S 232 *que dites vous — — que dis tu*

S 282 *parce que il avoit—parcequ'il*

S 284 *—ne serois donc gueure—guere*

S 300 *pour se déterminer leur propre mouvement—de leur propre*

S 302 *leur amour—sont exaltés—est exalte*

Dies sind, bester Herr Hofrath, die auffallendsten Fehler, die ich gefunden habe. Es sind noch unendlich viele andere, theils Druckfehler, theils Fehler in der Punctation, und in den accenten — Z B *Designe* — statt *Désigné* — *Pésér*, wohl 3 mahl mit einem accent, — *en ce, que* &c statt *en ce que* — Der Relativ wie in *celui qui, ceux qui* &c ist beynahe durchgangig von dem Pronomen demonstrativum getrennt, wie, *celui, qui avoit* &c — Diese Fehler aber, die in Vergleichung mit jenen wahre Kleinigkeiten sind, will ich nicht einmahl berühren, wiewohl es mir leicht seyn dorfte, vielleicht bey (*gestrichen*) in jeder Seite welche in der Art zu finden.

Ich bedaure sehr, daß solche Flecken in einem Werke sich befinden, (*darnach gestrichen* welche ich in (?) in dessen Uebersetzung ich mich bemüht hatte den Geist des Originals, wo nicht in der besten Schreibart, doch mit der möglichsten Genauigkeit aus zu drucken. Es ist wohl nicht zu befürchten, daß der geringste von diesen Fehlern auf die Rechnung des deutschen *Lucians* geschoben werden, da schon viele Franzosen die *Grazien, Musarion*, und *Agathon* lesen was werden sie aber von dem Uebersetzer denken, der bey allem dem sich noch untersteht zu sagen *C'est sous les yeux mêmes de l'auteur* &c. Was für einen Begriff sollte man von seinen Gesellschaften haben, nach den Wortern *femelle* und *Dévergondée*? — von seinen litterarischen und Sprachkenntnissen, nach jener undeutlichen, unfranzosischen, ewigen Periode? — Und von seiner Anmaßung ein solches Werk zu ubersetzen? — Denn ich muß wohl nach den häufigen franzosischen Fehlern für einen Deutschen gelten und ein Deutscher untersteht sich ein wielandisches Werk, wozu (*gestrichen*) zu dessen Uebersetzung der feinste Tact im Franzosischen gehört, in eine fremde Sprache zu übertragen? — — Man kennt ohnedas das feine Gefühl, und die (*darnach ein durchgestrichenes unleserliches Wort*) Gewandtheit in dem Genie der Franzosischen Sprache, welche der deutsche Verfasser besitzt, ich weis es am besten, ich den er durch seinen äusserst zarten Tact, für die Feinheiten der (*gestrichen, darüber* meiner) Sprache, die doch (*gestrichen*) so ausgebreitet sie auch ist, doch von wenigen Fremden ganz rein gefühlt wird, so oft in Erstauen setze. Und hierin wie viele Spuren von *Undelkatesse*? und unter seinen Augen sollten sie in das Werk eingeschlichen seyn? — Dies glaubt zwar kein Mensch. Indessen was gewinnt man dabey? — Daß die *Dialogues des D* nicht gelesen werden werden, ja, daß man davon in dem verachtlichsten Tone sprechen wird, wenn sie nicht auf irgend eine Art von dieser Puscherey gereinigt wird? (*gestrichen*) werden.

Hier haben Sie, lieber Herr Hofrath, meine Anmerkungen. Ich werfe mich mit meinem erstgebohrnen Kinde in Ihre vaterliche Arme, und verlasse mich ganz und gar auf Ihren Rath. Mit ungeduldiger Sehnsucht erwarte ich Ihre Antwort, der ich stets (*gestrichen*) mit der tiefsten Ehreubietung und der herzlichsten Anhänglichkeit stets verbleiben werde,

bester Herr Hofrath,

Ihr ganz gehorsamer Diener

Du Vau

Nehmen Sie beyliegendes Exemplar als einen allzugerungen Beweis meiner unauslöschlichen Dankbarkeit gutigst an. Ich muß wohl mit *alexxy* in *alexxy et justine*⁷ sagen *je n'ai qu'un cœur*. Ja, aber dieses wenigstens ist gut.

Ich bitte Sie mir das Exemplar worin meine Anmerkungen sind, zurück zu schicken —

Donnerstag den 20^{ten} 8ber

96

Ein eben noch zusammenhängendes Doppelblatt, 14 x 20 cm mit sehr großem Wasserzeichen, in welchem die Buchstaben GRAGALL (oder CRACALL?) zu erkennen sind. Der Anfang des Briefes findet sich nach Seuffert in der Landesbibliothek Dresden.

Pro! 3800 21 Oktober, 1796

Mein lieber Herr Chevalier

Der Mann, der sich, mit so großer Unfähigkeit zu einem solchen Unternehmen, unterstanden hat, Veränderungen in Ihrer Arbeit zu machen, — Veränderungen, welche so schreiende Beweise gegen seinen Geschmack, seine Sprachkunde u. s. w. ablegen — der Mann, der durch die unglücklichen Wörter *femelle* und *devergondée* gezeigt hat, was für schlechte Gesellschaften er zu sehen gewohnt seyn muß um solche Wörter sogar in Gottergesprachen zu gebrauchen — der Urheber der *Note*, welche zugleichzeit Fehler gegen den reinen Verstand, gegen den Geschmack und gegen die Grammatik enthält — kurz, der *Imbecille*, der sich so viel und mannigfaltig an Ihnen und der französischen Sprache und Grammatik versündigt hat, dieser Unglückliche, lieber Herr Chevalier, bin — ich selbst — Wenigstens größtentheils, denn einige wenige Fehler mögen doch vielleicht auf Herrn Meisters Rechnung kommen. Wie wollen Sie nun daß ich Ihnen einen Rath gegen mich selbst gebe? Ihr Werk ist, wie Sie überzeugt sind, durch meine Veränderungen entstellt und geschändet, und mit Fehlern beladen worden,

⁷ M. J. Goizet, *Dictionnaire universel du Théâtre en France* zitiert Alexis et Justine, com. lyr. en 2 a. et en pr. mêlée d'ariettes, paroles de M. (J-) M. Boutet, dit de Monvel, mus. de Desades, repr. à Versailles devant Leurs Majestés, le 14 janv. 1785, et à Paris le 17 (impr.) 1785.
Paris, Brunet

welche von dem *fallenden Kinde an bis zum Greis* aus keinem französischen Munde gehört worden &c &c Es bleibt Ihnen also nichts übrig, als je baldere je lieber das französische Publicum zu berichten, daß Sie an allen diesen *honneurs* unschuldig sind, und *mir* zu erlauben, daß ich mich öffentlich dazu bekenne und *amende honorable* deswegen thue

Sie sehen daraus, mit wem Sie Sich durch Übersetzung meiner Schriften compromittiert haben, und wie nothwendig es ist, daß Sie künftig nicht *sous mes yeux* sondern ganz allein *sous la dictée* Ihres eigenen Genius übersetzen, wenn Sie anders nicht (was ich Ihnen gern rathen möchte) von einer so undankbaren und Ihrem Ruhm so fatalen Unternehmung gänzlich abstahieren und Ihre Zeit nicht lieber auf etwas besseres verwenden wollen Ich schreibe Ihnen dies ohne alle Empfindlichkeit, was ich bedaure ist bloß die Sache selbst Ob ein geschickter Sachwalter der sich meiner annehmen wollte, nicht noch das eine oder andere zu meiner Defension zu sagen hatte, will ich dahin gestellt seyn lassen gewiß ist, daß ich selbst dazu weder Zeit noch Lust habe

Inzwischen hoffe ich Sie werden es sehr natürlich finden, wenn ich Sie bitte, sich von nun an mit Hin Gessner selbst in Correspondenz zu setzen, und solche Maßregeln zu nehmen, daß ich nichts weiter von den *Oeuvres choisies de Mr Wieland* zu sehen noch zu hören bekomme Ich überlasse Ihnen nun gänzlich zu thun, was Sie Ihrer so schwer beleidigten Autor oder Übersetzer-Ehre schuldig zu seyn glauben, und bin mit aller möglichen Achtung,

Dero

von Hause den 21 Octob 1796

gehorsamster Diener

Wieland

Doppelblatt, 18 5 x 22 cm, die 3 und 4 Seite leer Wasserzeichen im Falz mit den Buchstaben Bv & W (?).

Prol 3801. Nach 21 Okt. 1796.

Lieber Herr Chevalier

Verzeihen Sie und vergessen Sie, wenn Sie können, das unfreywillige Mißverhältnis, das vor etlichen Tagen in einem fatalen Augenblick zwischen uns entstand Mein Herz hat keinen Antheil daran Augenblicke dieser Art sind selten bey mir, aber in einem solchen Augenblick wurde ich meinen eigenen Sohn nicht freundlicher empfangen haben Es ist mir leid, daß gerade Sie, 1 Chevalier, diese Erfahrung von meiner bosen Laune machen mußten—das beste wäre indessen, dieser Sache als eines bosen Traums, der gar nicht in den Zusammenhang unsers wachenden Zustandes gehört, auf ewig zu vergessen Auf meiner Seite bleibt es bey dem alten, und ich bitte nicht einen Augenblick daran zu zweifeln, daß ich Sie aufrichtig schätze und nie aufhören werde Antheil an Ihnen zu nehmen Ihr Geschäfte mit Hrn Gessner werde ich bestens besorgen, und Sie sollen von Zurich aus des nahern darüber berichtet werden Ich bin diesen ganzen Nachmittag und Abend so sehr beschäftigt und zerstreut, daß ich Sie bitten muß, mich

vor meiner Abreise nicht zu sehen Ich hasse das Abschiednehmen ohnehin
Werden Sie mir wieder gut und gedenken meiner zuweilen unter Ihren
Freunden Sehen Sie Hn Lutkemuller zuweilen und haben die Gute ihn
im Franzosischen, besonders in der Aussprache, beforderlich zu seyn Emp-
fehlen Sie mich dem Verehrenden Mounier und dem Hn Chanouier,
fur welchen ich sehr tiefe Hochachtung habe, wiewohl meine Umstande mir
dieser Zeit nicht erlaubten, seinen Umgang zu suchen Leben Sie wohl,
lieber Du Vau Ich ziehe, gleich den Zugvögeln in ein warmer Land, das
schlimme ist, daß ich um die Zeit, da es wieder kalt zu werden anfangt,
auch wieder zuruckkehren muß das Angenehme davon aber wird seyn,
wenn ich Sie gesund, heiter und wohlbefindend wieder sehen werde Und
hiemit nochmahls Leben Sie wohl'

W

P S Hier ein paar allenfalls ostensible Zeilen das bewußte Mscpt
betreffend

Quartblatt 18 5 x 22 cm , Wasserzeichen nicht zu erkennen.

Pro1 3801^a, [22 oder 29 Oktober, 1796]

Werthester Herr Hofrath,

Ich habe gehort, daß Ihre Abreise auf einige Tage verschoben worden
ist, da ich Ihnen nicht ungelegen kommen mochte, und der Wunsch Sie
nochmahls zu sehen mir ziemlich natürllich ist, so bitte ich Sie nur wissen
zu lassen, ob ich Sie entweder Heute nachmittag, oder Morgen, falls Sie
nicht schon abreisen, besuchen darf

Ihr ganz gehorsamer Diener

Sonnabend früh

Du Vau

Zettel 11 x 18 cm Wasserzeichen unbestimmbar.

Pro1 3802 [nach 21 Okt 1796]

Mein Werthester Herr Chevalier

Ich muß es mir von Ihnen zur Gefälligkeit ausbitten, mich von der Hand
nicht zu besuchen, und falls wir uns am dritten Ort sehen sollten, keine
sonderliche Aufmerksamkeit auf mich zu zeigen Ich halte mich von Ihnen
nicht beleidigt, also ist keineswegs Empfindlichkeit über wukliche oder
vermeinte Beleidigung die Ursache meines Benehmens gegen Sie Genug,
ich bin mit Vergnügen bereit Ihr Mscpt an Hn Gefäner je balder je lieber
einzusenden (künftigen Montag konnt' es mit dem Postwagen geschehen)
und die *Note* oder *Declaration* welche Sie beyzufügen für nothig finden
mogen, kann gar wohl ohne Verabredung mit mir aufgesetzt werden,
zumahl da ich mirs zum unverbrüchlichen Gesetz gemacht habe, mich in
die Übersetzung meiner Schriften auf keine Weise mehr zu mischen In
allem ubrigen soll mir jede Gelegenheit angenehm seyn Ihnen meine
Dienstgefässenheit bewahren zu können

W

Zettel 10 5 x 18 cm Wasserzeichen unbestimmbar

Prol 4686 [nach 24 Aug 1803]

Verzeihen Sie mir, mein lebenswürdiger junger Freund, daß ich Ihnen meinen Dank für das Geschenk Ihres unterhaltenden Beytrags zur Kenntniß Ihres Landes und Volkes, unter tausend kleinen Abhaltungen aller Art, so lange vorenthalten habe. Ich habe Ihre Schrift mit Vergnügen und Theilnehmung gelesen, mit Theilnehmung an dem Trost, den Sie sich selbst so guttätig darüber—daß Sie Ihr Vaterland *nicht noch schlimmer* fanden, einzusprechen wissen, mit Vergnügen an den feinen und leichten Wendungen, womit Sie sich sowohl über das *was ist* als über das *was nicht ist*, bald durch *Entschuldigung* bald durch *Hoffnung* zu tauschen suchen. Hoffnung (sagt ein Heiliger Schriftsteller) laßt nicht zu Schanden werden.^a Moge Ihr Vaterland diesen Spruch durch Erfahrung bewahren! Oft schmeichle ich—der bey dem allen bloß als Mensch und als 70 jähriger Kosmopolit und Kosmotheoros interessiert ist—oft schmeichle ich mir mit der Hoffnung (die ich ohne Zweifel mit den meisten Ihrer Landesleute theile) daß auch in Frankreich auf einen Zweyten *Olivier* ein zweyter *Richard—Cromwell*, und auf diesen ein Zweyter *Monk* folgen werde. Ich wenigstens sehe bey meiner politischen Kurzsichtigkeit, keinen andern Weg des Heils für Europa und das neunzehnte Jahrhundert.

Mit vorzüglichem Vergnügen habe ich die Apologie Ihrer Nation gegen die Vorwürfe die ihr so oft ohne Billigkeit und Schonung gemacht werden, gelesen, Sie haben den französischen National-Karakter geschickt und glücklich aus dem verfälschenden Licht des Revolutionsfeuers in seinen wahren Gesichtspunkt und in das reine Sonnenlicht gestellt, und, in so fern die öffentliche Meinung keinem Volke gleichgültig seyn darf, sich dadurch um das Ihrige kein geringes Verdienst erworben. Was indessen Ihr kleines Buch am meisten auszeichnet und zum einzigen in seiner Art macht, ist, daß es, meines Wissens das Erste deutsche Buch ist, das von einem gebornen Franzosen und zwar so geschrieben ist, daß jedermann, der des Gegentheils nicht durch den Titel und die Vorrede belehrt worden wäre, den Verfasser für einen gebornen Deutschen halten würde. Eine einzige kleine Unrichtigkeit glaube ich, auf S 117 Z 8 von unten, bemerkt zu haben, wo Sie das Wortchen *ohnein* für *dem ungeachtet* oder *dennoch* gebraucht zu haben scheinen, vermuthlich weil Sie es für gleichbedeutend (*Synonym*) hielten. Daß aber wirklich ein zwar sehr *kleiner* Unterschied zwischen *ohnein* und *dennoch* sey, werden Sie (wenn mich mein Gedächtniß nicht trügt) aus Adelungs Wörterbuch eesehen können.

Mit wahrem Vergnügen sehe ich der Hoffnung, Sie in Weimar wieder zu sehen, entgegen. Inzwischen leben Sie wohl, mein edler Freund, und bleiben der besondern Achtung und warmen Freundschaft versichert, womit Ihnen lebenslanglich zugethan bleiben wird.

Ihr ergebenster

Wieland

^a Romer 5 5

Anschrift mit Siegel ruckwärts An Heirn Duvau im goldnen Engel in Dresden darunter gestrichen Leipzig

Doppelblatt 19 5 x 25 cm, zweiseitig beschrieben Wasserzeichen im Falz Posthorn

Nach dem Katalog der Bibliothèque Nationale lautet der Titel der mir unzugänglichen Schrift Wie fand ich mein Vaterland wieder im Jahre 1802? von August Duvau 1803 in-8 IV, 203 pp Die *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, in welcher das Buch am 21 Jan 1804 angezeigt wurde, fugt noch hinzu. Leipzig, b Goschen Der Ton der ausführlichen mit Fy unterzeichneten Rezension (Sp 140-144) ist durchaus ablehnend "Es war ihm (dem Vf) wohl nur vorzüglich darum zu thun, in der muhsam erlernten teutschen Sprache ein Buchlein anzufertigen"

W KURRELMAYER

DIE REIMSPRACHE DES 'TURKENKALENDER'

Es gehört zu den Merkwürdigkeiten der deutschen Wissenschaftsgeschichte, daß zwischen der Auffindung des frühesten datierbaren¹ Werks der europäischen Druckgeschichte im Jahre 1806 und seiner philologisch-kritischen Auswertung fast ein Jahrhundert verstreichen konnte Erst das Jahr 1900 bezeichnet einen Wendepunkt. Nachdem Gutenberg mit dem Druck in Verbindung gebracht war, kam eine Diskussion in Fluß über die Frage, ob ihm vielleicht auch der Text zuzuschreiben sei. Während der Druck unverkennbar rheinfränkischen Schreibungen folgt, wie sie besonders auch der Mainzer Kanzlei eigen sind, schimmert vor allem in den Reimen eine Mundart der Vorlage durch, in der J Joachim elsassische Eigenheiten erblickte Von Wyss abweichend kam er 1901 zu dem Schluß, "daß der Dichter und Drucker nicht eine Person gewesen sein können, jener war vielmehr ein Elsasser, dieser ein Rheinfranke"² Diesem Ergebnis hat sich 1902 ein so gediegener Kenner

¹ In der zweiten Dezieemberhalfte 1454 — Daß der Druck 'datiert' sei, wie seit Wyss' Aufsatz in der *Gutenberg Festschrift* von 1900 immer wieder erwähnt wird, ist nicht ganz zutreffend, das Druckdatum ist nur aus Vers 22 zu erschliessen, der als Jahr des Kalendars 1455 nennt

² Joh Joachim, Die 'Mahnung der Christenheit wider die Turken' aus dem Ende von 1454 *Sammlung bibliothekswissenschaftlicher Arbeiten*, Vol 14 (1901), 87-102 Obiges Zitat ist von S 101

der deutschen Mundarten wie Edward Schroder angeschlossen³ Womit die Diskussion beendet war In seinem *Fruhneuhochdeutschen Lesebuch* (Gottingen 1920,² 1925) fuhrt denn auch Alfred Gotze den Teilabdruck der *Mahnung* mit dem Satz ein “Sie ist nach E Schroder in Frankfurt oder Mainz von einem Elsasser verfaßt und in Mainz gedruckt”

Wie wunschenswert, an einem Text noch aus der Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts im Einzelnen einmal zeigen zu konnen, wie sich elsassische Formen in der Hand des Mainzer Kopisten verandern, wie selbst der unantastbare Reim selbst in der als sorgsam berühmten Gutenbergwerkstatte verunreinigt wird Andererseits kann die Wiederherstellung der Reime zugleich das ursprungliche Schriftbild wiederherstellen, aus der dann ja die Mundart des Verfassers leicht zu erschliessen ist Wie schon, ein Hauptproblem der Sprachgeschichte, das des Ausgleichs der Mundarten im 15 Jh, an einem so würdigen Denkmal illustrieren zu konnen Da Schroder 1902 mit den bahnbrechenden Reimuntersuchungen v Kraus⁴ und besonders Zwierzinas vertraut gewesen ist, darf man sich auf die Feststellung verlassen, “daß die Reime, sobald man die zumeist von Joachim richtig erkannten *Alsatismen* in Rucksicht zieht, von absoluter Reinheit sind!” Das ist ja eine wichtige Aussage, da man von einer Gelegenheitsreimerei aus dem 15 Jh, das ein so viel besungenes Ereignis beschreibt wie den militärischen Erfolg der Turken nebst Aufruf an die abendländische Christenheit ‘deutscher’ Zunge zum Kampf gegen den Glaubensfeind, kaum mundartliche Aufschlusse erwarten wird, selbst wenn sie ein reicheres Material bietet als das der 188 Verse 188 Reime aber sind genug, ihren Verfasser im Elsaß zu lokalisieren.—

Demgegenüber behaupte ich, daß nichts von dem, was Joachim als elsassisch erklart, einer genauen Nachprufung standhält. Als Heimat des Dichters laßt sich weder eindeutig das Elsaß sichern, noch sogar das Straßburgische, dessen Schriftdialekt nicht erst in dieser Zeit unter dem Einfluß mittelhheinischer Einstrahlung md Farbungen aufweist und mit dem Niederelsassischen nicht identisch ist⁴ Es ist ungemein schwer, die Sprache eines kurzen Denk-

³ “Ich stimme [Joachims] Ergebnissen durchaus, und der Art, wie sie gewonnen sind, fast immer bei” Ed Schroder, *Philologische Beobachtungen zu den ältesten Mainzer und Bamberger Drucken Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* XIX (1902), 443

⁴ Vgl, was Zwierzina *Zs* 44 (1900), 294 über “rheinische Eigentümlichkeiten Gottfrieds und anderer Niederrheinländer” sagt

mals von nicht sehr ausgeprägter Sonderart exakt zu lokalisieren, und ich sage nicht, dass ich das kann. Nur ist es Joachim auch nicht geglückt. Schroder hatte es mit einem Hinweis auf Differenzen zwischen Vorlage und Druck genugsam lassen und nicht verfügen sollen, der Druck sei elsassisch.

Das Wiederaufnahmeverfahren kann sich eine Elortierung aller der 'Alsatismen' schenken, von denen die neuere Mundartenforschung einen Wirkungsraum festgestellt hat, der zu weit ist, um eine Lokalisierung zu erlauben, hier stehen nur Joachims beweiskräftigste Zeugen zur Debatte. Doch will ich zuvor an wenigstens einem Beispiel klarmachen, mit welchen Komplikationen eine Untersuchung dieser Art zu rechnen hat.

Anlaßlich eines Reimes von *hant* (3 Plur) *lant* spricht Joachim aaO 98 von einer "in elsassischen Quellen ganz gewöhnlichen Verkürzung". Die scheint nicht nur durch den Reim bewiesen, sondern dadurch daß *ā* in unserm Denkmal oft als *o* erscheint, erhaltenes *o* also als *ā* aufzufassen ist. Aber V 93 druckt die Gutenbergwerkstätte *haist* im Reim auf *fast*. Da postvokalisches *i* westmd. Langenzeichen ist, deutet der Druck auf eine Form *hāst*. Da hatten wir denn also eine Bindung von *ā* *ā*, die wohl eher rheinfrankisch als alem., und eher ostmd. als westmd. ist. Bei Fischart gibt es solche Reime,⁵ die sich wohl auf Konto seines Wormser Aufenthalts kommen. (Im Gedicht sind in 30 Reimpaaren *ā* und *ā* 28mal sauberlich geschieden, die einzigen beiden 'unreinen' Reime betreffen *hant* und *hast*, die demnach sicherlich als Kurzen zu lesen sind. Diese Kurzformen sind aber laut Zwierzina bzw. Paul-Gierach, *Mhd. Grammatik*¹² (1929) § 180 2 Anm. 2 Merkmal alem. und frank. Quellen.) Jeder, der auch nur bis zur ersten der Mhd. Studien Zwierzinas Zs. 44 (1900) 1 ff. fortgeschritten ist, weiß nun aber, daß die reinliche Scheidung der *a*-Quantitäten alem. Kennzeichen ist, beweist also nicht grade die Druckform *haist* = *hāst* *fāst*, daß die Quantitätscheidung für Mainz keine Geltung hat? Auf diese Frage gibt es wieder zwei Antworten. Einmal gibt es rheinfrank. Dichter von der gleichen Empfindlichkeit für die *a*-Quantitäten wie Alem. (s. Zwierzina aaO 25), oder es liegt in *haist* des Mainzers möglicherweise eine hyperhochdeutsche Schriftform vor, eine Kunstform des westmd. Schriftdialekts. Kolnische Texte des

⁵ Vgl. Krell, *Studien z. Sprache Fischarts aus seinen Reimen* I (München 1913), § 31, Kozumplik, *The Phonology of Jacob Ayer's Language, based on his rhymes* (Chicago 1942), 97 f.

13 (z B. Gotfrid Hagen) ebenso wie des 15. Jahrhundert (z B. Koelhoffs *Cronika*) zeigen nicht nur *haist*, *hart*, *hann*, sondern auch *verstoinden* < *verstünden*, *geweist* < *gewëst*, *lassen* < *lâssen* ⁶

Somit beweisen die mehrdeutigen Reim- bzw. Druckformen des *Turkenkalenders* zwar Kurzformen für das Prasens von *haben* sowie Scheidung von *ā* und *ǣ*, aber beides ist sowohl alem als rheinfrank d h untauglich zur Lokalisierung des Textes in Straßburg oder Frankfurt-Mainz

Und dieser Tatbestand wiederholt sich wieder und wieder

Durch den Reim bewiesenes *stāt* veranlaßt Joachim zu der Bemerkung, “daß in der Vorlage nicht das aus Mainzer Quellen allein zu belegende *stet*, sondern nur obd *stat* gestanden haben kann” (aaO 99) Er halt die *stāt/stēt*- Linie also für eine den Norden vom Süden trennende, eine Parallele zur Benrather Linie, was doch (laut Wagner, *Deutsche Sprachlandschaften*, Karte *gān/gēn*) nur für das Gebiet nördlich der Hunsrück-Westerwald Barriere gilt Südlich davon scheidet sie den Osten vom Westen. Daher sich denn auch *stāt* fortwährend aus Mainzer Quellen belegen läßt Vgl Wilhelm, *Corpus* 236 27, 495 33, 498 14 u o

Zweimal, im Reim zu *Lotringen* und *Toringen*, ist *bringen* als Form des Dichters erweisen Der Mainzer Drucker folgt seiner Mundart und zerstört den Reim dadurch, daß er *bringen* setzt. Daß *bringen* die obd Lautform ist, versichern Grammatiken wie Wörterbücher Dazu stimmt ja auch, daß die *ι*-Form in Mainz offenbar zu ungebrauchlich ist, um sich in der dortigen Druckerei zu behaupten Sie muß sich eine Übertragung ins Md gefallen lassen — Nun reimt aber der Stockosterreicher Heinrich v Neustadt ‘md’ *bringen* *Apoll* 13704 ist nicht sicher (die Straßburger Hs hat eine abweichende Lesart und ändert die Zeile, wohl, weil ihr *bringen* unbehaglich war), wird aber 19941 durch Reim auf den Infin. *lengen* = *langer machen*, *Gottes Zukunft* 5084 auf den Infin. *verhengen* gesichert. Bei dem Thüringer Heinrich v Hesler wiederum ist die *ι*-Form nicht verpont, *bringes(t)* steht im Reim 3954; 21859. Und noch Ayser in Nürnberg reimt sowohl *bringen* wie *bringen* ohne andern Unterschied als den der Reimbarkeit. Der Gebrauch des Infin. *bringen* genügt also sicherlich nicht zur Herkunftsbestimmung des Textes im Alem.

⁶ Über das Phänomen unter Angabe weiterer Literatur V Moser, *Fruhnhd Grammatik*, 21 Anm 2.

Wirklich beeindruckt bin ich dagegen von dem Reim *sint kint*, aus dem sich die 2 Plur *ir sint* ergibt. Bei Paul-Gierach aaO § 155 Anm 3, § 178 Anm 2 ist der Geltungsbereich dieser Form abgegrenzt als "Alem, auch sudrheinfrank." Und 1944 stellt die Neuauflage fest "Alem lautet die 2 Plur *sind* statt *sit*." Dazu kommt, daß V 148 unseres Gedichts die Druckform hat *Halten ich zu samen vnd s jt getruwe*, was sich ja nur dahin deuten läßt, daß der Mainzer Drucker im Versinnern seine Verbalform einsetzt. Aber warum tut er es denn dann nicht bei *halten*, wofür ja in der Vorlage *haltent* gestanden haben muß? Die 2 Plur erscheint übrigens noch elfmal im Druck, immer aber in dieser Form: *helftent, habent, schrickent, sehent, nement, sprechent, versorgent, ziehent, bestellent*. Die einzigen beiden Abweichungen von der *-ent* Form befinden sich in ein- und derselben Zeile, und sie wieder sind darin nicht übereinstimmend, sondern lassen einmal das *-t*, ein andermal das *-n-* fort. *Syt* bietet der Text auch sonst noch häufig als Konjunktion, so mag sich die Schreibung eingeschmuggelt haben. Ich halte übrigens die ganze Zeile für unecht: sie ist als letzte dem Novemberspruchangepappt, nachdem schon die astronomischen Bestimmungen gegeben sind, die sonst regelmässig das Ende der Monatssprüche bilden. Gesucht war ein Reim auf V 147 *nuwe*, so wurde 148 noch augesetzt. Aber ob oder ob nicht das so ist, als ausschlaggebend ist zu betrachten, daß der Drucker, dessen westmd. Schreibungen unverkennbar sind, in 11 Fällen von 13 eine Verbalform druckt, die angeblich alem ist. Wenn Joachim anlässlich *sint* sagt, die Form "weist nach dem Elsaß, obgleich sie rheinfrank. Quellen dieser Zeit nicht ganz fremd ist," gibt ihm mindestens unser Mainzer Druckwerk recht. Doch ist dieses *sint* das schwerstwiegende Beweisstück Joachims.

Denn alles andere lohnt kaum die Zurückweisung. V 29 wird *dreist* (< *tregist* von ihm als "durchaus elsassisch," ich muß schon sagen, empfunden. Laut Zwierzina Zs. 44, 345, Paul-Gierach § 86 3 und 4 ist *egi* er sowohl alem als westmd. — Den Reim V 65 *norwegen sweigen* nennt Joachim "eine Lautbildung, die zwar allgemein mitteldeutsch zu sein scheint, aber auch für das Elsassische durchaus anzunehmen ist." Die Karte der elsass. Mundarten (bei Martin-Lienhart als *sagen/sajen* Linie) engt die Großzügigkeit dieser Feststellung durch Details ein, daß nämlich südlich von Schlettstadt nur noch der Kreis um Colmar die Spirantisierung erlaubt, die aber jedenfalls Straßburg-Stadt sicher einschließt. Was

den Vokalismus des Reims angeht, so fällt *ej ey* in jene “mitteldeutsch—alem Gruppe,” von der Zwierzina *Zs* 44, 283 spricht Zwischen Straßburg und Frankfurt-Mainz ist da eine Entscheidung nicht zu treffen—Vers 67 reimt *hochgezijt gelijt* Dieses *gelit* ist schon aus *Tristan* 8324 bekannt, kann also als “straßburgisch” gelten Davon, daß es, wie Joachim will, “durchaus elsassisch” ist, kann keine Rede sein Die Nachweise für *gelit* bei Lexer I, 817 mit *Elsabeth, Passional K*, dem ich das *Vaterbuch* noch hinzufügen kann, beschränken sich streng auf Westmitteldeutschland, genauer aufs Rheinheßische und nördlich davon Im *Tristan* ist die Form ‘rheinisch,’ in Mainz, bzw Frankfurt ist sie bodenständig

Der Reim von *satzten schatte* (<*schadete*) macht Joachim keine Schwierigkeiten, hier “ist die in den Straßburger Sprachdenkmalern fast durchweg gebrauchte Form *satte(n)* einzusetzen” Was ihm hier geradezu als Straßburger Idiomatik gilt, wird von Zwierzina *Zs* 45, 44 u 46 Anm der elsass Mundart abgesprochen und dem elsass Literaturdialekt zugewiesen, der mittelhheinisches Formengut den Rhein aufwärts nach Strassburg einschwemmt Hier, wie gelegentlich auch sonst, steht die Stadtersprache Straßburgs dem Mosel- und Rheinfränkischen nicht fern Aber über die eigentliche Heimat der Form s Paul-Gierach § 93 und 95 Anm 3

Das rheinische *satte* bringt mich nun schon zu den Erscheinungen, die für die Mainzer Heimat des Textes schwer ins Gewicht fallen Der Akk von *Lowe* erscheint V.109 im Reim zu *Genuesen* als *lauwen genauwer* Auch Joachim verwertet diesen Reim “Die Nebenform *lauwen* ist wohl hauptsächlich auf alem Gebiet zu belegen *Lowe* findet sich zweimal in dem von Bernoulli aus einer Colmarer Hs in *Germania* xxx, 215 mitgeteilten Reimspruch, auch der Züricher Jos Maaler hat *loeuw* (sic!) Im Rheinfrank scheint *lewe* gebräuchlich gewesen zu sein Die Form *Genauwe* ist analog dem Straßburger *Badouwe* (Padua) gebildet, auch Maaler hat *Gennauw* ” Dazu ist dreierlei zu bemerken

1 Was die Colmarer Hs wirklich hat, ist *löwen*, und das ist im 2. Viertel des 15 Jh. etwas anderes als *lauwen* eine Dekade später. 2 ist Maalers schweizer Form nicht ‘auch’ *lauwe*, sondern klar im Gegenteil *lōuw(e)*, entsprechend seiner Vorlage Frisius, der *louw* druckt 3 Daß *Genover* > *Genouwer* > *Genauwer*¹ entwickelt

¹ Stanley Werbow verdanke ich den Hinweis auf die *Chronik* des Mainzer (‘) Finanzbeiraters des Kaisers Sigismund, Eberhard Windeck

wird, wiegt hier nur insofern, als es die Form *lauwe* beweist, deren Heimat festzustellen wir bestrebt sind. Dieses *lauwe* ist laut Diefenbach 324b bereits in einem *Vocabularius* von 1420 (5b) belegt, dessen Vorlage auf ein in Mainz 1414 geschriebenes Wörterbuch zurückgeht. Das Lemma *leo* in Diefenbachs *Novum Glossarium* gibt für unsere Form noch zwei weitere Quellen, eine (37) und aus dem Jahre 1417, die andere (38), auch nd, aus der Mitte des 15. Jh. — Daß *au* statt *obd* *eu* ein westmd. Charakteristikum ist, ist ja keineswegs neu und spielt eine Rolle bei der Betrachtung des Reimes 133 *gruwe* (*Grauen*) . *nuwe* (*Neue*). Das ist ja ein sicherer Reim von mhd. *û* *u*,⁸ der als Form des Dichters md. *nûwe* beweist. Paul-Gierach § 100 gibt als Südgrenze dieses *nûwe* den Main. Frankfurt oder Mainz lassen es erwarten, Straßburg schwerlich, für das übrige Elsaß ist die Form ausgeschlossen.⁹ V 163 ist der Reim von *stete* (lat. *urbes*) *hette* (Indik. Imperf.) sicherlich nicht alem., sondern laut Zwierzina *Zs.* 44, 109 Anm. "md. oder besser rheinisch." Mainz ist also entschieden vor Straßburg der Vorzug zu geben.

Die Ergebnisse der Betrachtung der Reime lassen sich dahin zusammenfassen, daß für das Elsaß nur eine Form (*ir sint*) spricht, und auch sie nicht eindeutig, da dem Mainzer Drucker die *-nt* Endung der 2. Plur. ganz gelaufig ist. Alle andern Reimformen schliessen das Westmd. nicht aus, sprechen in einigen Fällen stark dafür, sind im Fall von *nûwe* beweisend. Dennoch kann von einem sicheren Ergebnis keine Rede sein. Schon im 13., und um wieviel starker also im 15., Jahrhundert zeigt der Straßburger Schrift-dialekt entschieden rheinfrankische Merkmale, auf die schon 1877 Krauter (*Zs.* 21, 258-273) aufmerksam gemacht hat, und deren Gewicht seither schwerer und schwerer empfunden worden ist. Man darf in diesem Zusammenhang wieder daran erinnern, daß der Straßburger Drucker der ersten deutschen Druckbibel, Mentel, seinem Druck 1465 eine nordbair. Vorlage zu Grunde legte, deren Lautstand in Straßburg schon nicht mehr befremdete. Ob ein Schriftdenkmal von ca. 1450 Straßburg oder Mainz zugeschrieben

⁸ S. 86 des in Mainz zwischen 1440 und 1445 geschriebenen Manuskripts findet sich als Bezeichnung der Bewohner von Genua das Wort *genawer*.

⁹ vgl. Diefenbach 280c (*horror*), auch *Lexicon* I, 1108 f.

¹⁰ Weder Joachim noch Edw. Schröder haben diesem entscheidenden Reim Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt.

werden muß, ist im Allgemeinen garnicht so eindeutig zu entscheiden. Bei einem so wenig umfangreichen, literarisch so anspruchslosen Dokument wie unserm wird zumal die Reimuntersuchung kaum zum Ziele führen. Es ist ein glücklicher Zufall, der es erlaubt, Straßburg, wenn nicht als Ursprungsort auszuschliessen, so doch unwahrscheinlich zu machen.

Den Ausschlag gegen Straßburg geben aber Erwägungen anderer Art. Daß “alles in diesem Druck rheinfrankisch ist,” hat Schroder mit Recht betont, nur beschränkt er seine Aussage auf das Druckbild. Ebenso deutlich ergibt sich, daß Dichter und Drucker nicht ein und dieselbe Person sein können — Ende April 1454 hatte sich ein Reichstag in Regensburg mit der politischen Situation befaßt, Mitte Oktober wurde er noch einmal nach Frankfurt einberufen und durch einen Stadtetag zum Abschluß gebracht. Die Reichstagsabschiede und Resolutionen wurden in der *Mainzer* Reichskanzlei bearbeitet. Das Gedicht ist eine bestellte Arbeit aus der Umgebung des Aeneas Silvius, der als Vertreter des Kaisers nach Frankfurt gekommen war, die Bestellung lief also ein — aus der Mainzer Kanzlei. Vielleicht nur der Auftrag, vielleicht sogar schon der Text. Denn für das bißchen Reimerei gab es sicherlich Kanzleibeamte, rhetorischer Wendungen kundige Juristen, deren Schreibweise mehr als von ihrer eigenen Mundart vom Aktendeutsch in Mainz gefarbt war. Die Schreiberhand des Kanzlisten ist so unverkennbar wie die Druckerhand des Mainzers. Die Heimat des Kanzleibeamten läßt sich naturgemäß nicht definitiv bestimmen. Da aber lautlich oder sprachlich nichts für Straßburg spricht und nichts gegen Mainz (bzw. Frankfurt), scheint es mir nicht angängig, weiterhin von einem elsassischen Dokument zu sprechen.

Die Differenzen zwischen Vorlage und Druck spiegeln nicht den geographischen Abstand zwischen der Heimat des Dichters und der des Druckers, sondern den sozialen Abstand zwischen Mainzer Reichskanzlei und Mainzer Offizin.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

THE "BROWN NIGHT" IN THE GERMAN BAROQUE

The theory was advanced by Karl Vietor in 1938 that the phrase, *braune Nacht*, and hence the association of the adjective *braun* with the night, shadows, clouds and their attributes, came into the German literature of the seventeenth century through Tobias Hubner, who, in turn, took the association from his favorite models, the French writers of the Pleiade. Hubner first used the phrase itself in 1623, Opitz followed him in 1630, Friedrich von Spee used it in 1634. After them the writers of the seventeenth and even early eighteenth centuries took up the mode.¹ However, its period of greatest frequency lay after 1640.

Although the Pleiade remains unquestioned as the ultimate source for the reintroduction of the broader, general meaning into German, it appears likely that the route of introduction was more complex than has heretofore been indicated. It is well known that Holland enjoyed its literary revival and came under the sway of the Pleiade much earlier than Germany. We shall see below that the Dutch writers adopted the Romanic phrases far earlier than the Germans. The German writers, having the Romanic and the Dutch models before them, were able, bolstered by the existence of the phrases in a language so like their own, to adopt them into their own literary production.

The importance of Holland for the writers of the German Baroque was recognized early. The educated men, who were the writers of this time, travelled in Holland and thus came into contact with the literary upsurge which was flourishing there in the early seventeenth century.

Holland — das Zentrum aller nördlichen Barockkultur, die Werde- und Reifestätte der Nurnberger, Sachsen und Schlesier — nimmt ihn [Zesen] gefangen, heftiger als die Opitz und Zinkgreif, Harsdorffer und Rist, Fleming und Roberthin, Lohenstein und Hofmannswaldau, Canitz und Neumark, mehr noch als selbst den Gryphius.²

It appears more likely that these men and others³ brought home

¹ Karl Vietor, "Die Barockformel 'braune Nacht'," *ZfdPh* 63 (1938) 284 ff.

² Herbert Cysarz, *Deutsche Barockdichtung*, Leipzig, 1924, 61.

³ For a good, short sketch of the literary life of Holland to which the Germans were exposed as students and travellers, see J. E. Gillet, "De Nederlandsche letterkunde in Duitschland in de zeventiende eeuw," *Tijds-*

the device of the "brown night" first-hand than that the whole phenomenon was due to the influence of Hubner or even Opitz. Let the high praise which Opitz accorded the Dutch suffice to indicate the degree of his and, hence, of his followers' regard for those writers

So konnten die Amsterdamer *Achilles* und *Polyxena*, *Theseus* und *Aradne*, *Granida*, Gerhardt van Velsen, Roderich und *Alphonsus*, *Griana*, Spanischer Brabanter, *Lucella*, stummer Ritter, *Ithys*, *Polyxena*, *Isabella* und andere fast dem *Seneca* und *Terentio* dem hoflichsten unter allen Lateinischen *Scribenten*, an die Seite gesetzt werden ⁴

As Witkowski pointed out in his introduction to the *Poemata*, Opitz has mentioned the works of Hooft, Bredero and Coster.⁵ It is Hooft, the chief Dutch playwright of the first half of the seventeenth century, who gives us our first example of "brown" in this sense, although no absolute priority is claimed for it. In a poem dated Florence, 1600, but perhaps not printed until 1653, it is applied to the clouds

merck inde lucht een vrouw overtogen was
Gansch van een bruine wolck ⁶

From his play *Granida*, written in 1605 and first published in 1615, we have two interesting examples. The first reminds us of von Spee's *braune Rappen*,⁷

De nacht compt opter Aerden
Geballen met haer schim,
En met haer bruine paarde
Berijden onse kim (II, 170)

The second

Neen, want int west noch niet gedaen sijn,
De bruine grijnsen van des hemels vrolijck anschijn, (II, 183)

Bredero, who died two years before Opitz' visit to Holland in 1620 but whose works were being eagerly reprinted in the years

schrift voor Nederlandsche Taal en Letterkunde, 33 (1914) 1-31, and also Cornelia Boumann, *Philipp von Zesens Beziehungen zu Holland*, Diss. Bonn, 1916, 1 24. See also C. K. Pott, *JEGP* XLVII (1948), 127-138.

⁴ Martin Opitz, *Teutsche Poemata*, Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts, nr. 189, Halle, 1902, 5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, iv.

⁶ P. Cz. Hooft, *Gedichte*, Amsterdam, 1871, I, 12.

⁷ Viator, op. cit., 290.

following his early death, seems to have had a special fondness for our formula. In his *Griane*, produced on the stage in 1612 and published in 1616, we have the phrase itself.

Bekleedt de blauwe lucht met graauwe wolck-gardiynen
 'tIs best Florendus dat ghy in u huys vertreckt
 (*Binnen*) Tot dat de bruyne nacht de Aarde gants bedeckt *

The same writer's *Klucht vanden Molenaer*, which was written in 1613 and printed in 1618, shows the word as an adjective for the night, though not in the formula

Dattet daer waerde en spoeckten, als het snachts hiel bruyne was,
 (I, 273, l 131)

From the *Spaanschen Brabander Jerolmo* of 1617 or 1618 (the first printing is not dated) comes a use in the meaning "dark."

Dan riep ik, het sal donderen van desen dagh,
 So bruyne komtet ginder up (II, 156, l 112 f)

A further use in the meaning "dark," applied to the clouds, is found in the *Boetigh Liedt-boeck*, published in 1622

Met greep hy my om 't lijf, en vlooch stracks door de Wolcken,
 Tot in het Eeuw Palleys, zyn alderhoochste kruyn,
 Hy sprack verheught tot myn, (in 't Aackelighe bruyne)
 (III, 246, l 6 ff)

The third writer, whose works are mentioned by Opitz in the preface, did not yield a single instance of this usage to a cursory examination. Coster has the more usual *donker*, *duister* and *zwart* where the context for our word occurs so that a conscious avoidance of the imported formula may be possible. This conclusion is not necessary, however, since most contexts, in the other writers too, show the above words rather than *bruyne*. This was a conscious, literary device, which apparently had to be used with discretion.

Of the generation preceding the above men, and of great importance to their art was Heindrik Laurensz Spieghel, from whom we have another early example. His main work, the fragment *Hertspieghel*, was published in 1614, two years after his death. It offers a transferred use.

Des aerdrjx zwarte schaaw die spand haar bruyne deken,
 Besprengt met flonker vonken, om ons aerden-kreys *

* G. Az. Bredero, *De Werken*, Amsterdam, 1890, I, 112, line 106 ff

* H. L. Spieghel, *Hertspieghel en andere zedeschriften*, Amsterdam, 1723, 69.

Joost van den Vondel was perhaps the most influential of all the Dutch poets, at least in the second half of the century. Yet the examples given here are taken from his earlier works. The first, although here again no absolute priority is claimed for it, comes from his *Wtvaert en Treurdicht van Henricus de Grootte*, which was written on the death of Henry IV in 1610 and published in 1622

Des Hemels oogh verdompt zijn fackel inde locht
De blauwen Hemel sich ontluystert al met eenen
Gelijckmen menighmaal de teeckens en voorboden
Van 't aastaande onweer ziet, als over 's werelds kruyn
Sich donder, blixem, wint wroeght dampigh, mistigh bruyn,¹⁰

From his *Warande der Dieren*, first published in 1617, comes an application to the shadow of foliage

Een Voghelaer in 't veld uytspannende zijn garen,
Ghezeten onder 't bruyn van schaduwende blaren, (I, 531)

We have another transferred sense, this time of the wings of the night, in his *Hierusalem Verwoest* of 1620

Waer voor de donck're nacht weeck met zijn bruyne vlercken
(II, 730)

In *Bruyloft-Bed van P. C. Hooft en H. Hellemans*, written for the wedding of his friend Hooft in 1627, Vondel wrote

't en is geen tijd die oogen toe te luycken,
Die ick ter hemelvaert voor faeckels sal gebruycken,
Om in de bruyne lucht te maecken 't waegenspoor
(II, 648, l 340 ff)

In the same poem, a few lines further on

Ach waeron deekt Natuur d' aenlockelijcke naeckheyd
Der schoonheyden 't gebruyck der gysent volmaecktheyd
Soo schuw met schaduw und met sluyer bruyn en wit?
(II, 650, l 403 ff)

Another case of *bruine schaduwen* occurs in *Joseph in Dothan* (III, 767, l 858), published in 1640. The only instance of the formula itself appears in his Virgil translation, in 1646

en de bruine nacht alle dinge even zwart verft (V, 258)

Specialists in the field of Dutch literature will probably be able

¹⁰ Joost van den Vondel, *De Werken*, Amsterdam, 1855-69, I, 32, l 115 ff

to add to this list of examples from the works of poets of the seventeenth and perhaps even sixteenth century

A second question raised by Vietor's article is the interesting one of the semantic development of the loan word *brûn*. Departing from the fact that the phrase *braune Nacht* was a literary borrowing from the French, he assumed that the meaning "dark" was foreign to the originally Germanic word and hence had developed in the Romance languages. He wrote

So kehrte durch wortliche, all-zuwortliche Übersetzung aus dem Französischen ein Wort, das als Bezeichnung für die Farbe Braun aus dem Germanischen in die romanischen Sprachen übernommen worden war, in einer neuen Bedeutung, die es erst in diesem neuen Sprachraum angenommen hatte, ins Deutsche zurück. Aber freilich nur in den engen Kreis eines vorübergehenden Dichtung Stils. Die neue Bedeutung musste dem Deutschen fremd, ja befremdend sein.¹¹

Yet the dictionaries of the Germanic languages attest to the meaning "dark, black" for the stem *brûn* and indicate that the color designation as such was a later and not general development. Grein's *Sprachschatz* lists *brûn* as "*niger, ater, fuscus, badius*"¹². Bosworth-Toller lists *brûn* as "dark, dusky" and cites *þþ sív brúne*, calling attention to Dante's *onda bruna*. Curiously too, *brúnne brerð* means the "black rim of the ink horn"¹³. In Icelandic too, the meaning "black" has remained for our word. *Brúnn* is the name for a black horse, and in Old Icelandic *brún klæði* is the black dress of a divine.¹⁴ The modern Icelandic compound *kolbrúna-myrkur* is used of the darkness of the night, much as we would say "pitch-black."¹⁵

The situation in older German is similar. Schade gives *dunkel-farbig* along with *glanzend* and *braun*,¹⁶ and Graff lists *furvum* among other meanings.¹⁷ Although the Middle High German uses indicate that the word had already then narrowed in German to a

¹¹ Vietor, *op cit*, 289

¹² C. W. M. Grein, *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*, Heidelberg, 1912, 74

¹³ T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, Supplement, Oxford, 1921, 108

¹⁴ R. Cleasby, *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1874

¹⁵ S. Blondal, *Íslensk-Dönsk Orðabók*, Reykjavík, 1920-1924

¹⁶ Oskar Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*, Halle, 1882, I, 87

¹⁷ E. G. Graff, *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz*, Berlin, 1834, III, 311

color designation, it was still capable of at least figurative use in the meaning "dark" Surely, *tunkel* and *brûn* are synonymous in the oft quoted

iuwer lûter edelkeit ist worden tunkel unde brûn¹⁸

Wackernagel called attention to a fixed phrase in which the meaning "dark, black" was still text

Got niht eine luge durch si taete, so dasz er spraeche "brûn ist blanc"

He asked himself whether the word *brûn* might not mean "black" in a case under consideration and observed Es hat diesen Sinn gelegentlich im Mittelhochdeutschen so gut als im Altnordischen¹⁹

For Early New High German, Gotze pointed out Frisius' listings for *brûn*²⁰ There we find the adjective *fuscus* translated with *braun*, *dunkel* and the verb *fusco*, "*braun oder dunckel machen/verdunckeln*"²¹ Diefenbach cites the meaning *brun* for *fuscus* from the *Gemma Gemmarum* (Köln, 1507) and for *fuscare* he translates *preuwen* and cites *brunen* from the *Vocabularius Theuthonicus* (Nürnberg, 1482 (Zeninger))²² The *Dictionary tetraglotton* (Antwerp, 1562) yields another decisive entry "Fuscus a, um, Cic φαῖος Brun, Obscur, Tenebreux Bruyn/Doncker/Duyster" The meaning 'twilight, dusky' is particularly strengthened by the Greek φαῖος Even Grimm's *Wörterbuch* translates *braun* with *gebrannt*, *brandschwarz*, *ater*, *fuscus* and cites M. H. G. *zobel brûn als ein bere* (En 36, 33)

The semantic development of the word in Dutch must be of special interest to us Here too, the more general meaning "dark" was original Muller-Kluyver has the following to say

Just as in the case of the other color names (e g, *blauw*, *bleek*, *blond*, *grauw*, *grijs*) it appears also in the case of *bruin* that the more limited meaning only gradually became usual Even where actually the same color which we today so designate was intended, there was formerly probably no more signified than dark of color or hue, see Verdam 1, 1468 *brune persche*

¹⁸ Ch H Myller, *Sammlung deutscher Gedichte*, Berlin, 1782 85, III, 13a

¹⁹ Wilhelm Wackernagel, *Kleinere Schriften*, Leipzig, 1872, I, 165

²⁰ Alfred Gotze, "Wortgeschichtliche Gedanken und Zeugnisse," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung*, 12 (1910), 203

²¹ J Frisius, *Dictionary latino-germanicum*, Zurich, 1568

²² L Diefenbach, *Glossarium Latino Germanicum mediae et infimae aetatis*, Frankfurt a M, 1857

(*paarse*) as opposed to *lichte persche*, and Middle Dutch *pruunpers*, *bruun root*, *bruunvisch*, *bruunlijst* (as opposed to *bleek*) And even later, indeed in our own time, brown and black are confused with each other or not clearly distinguished, see some of the quotations given below under A) and B) as Hooft Tac 502 (where *nigra* is translated by *zwart* but also, if need be, by *bruun*, *atra* on the contrary is translated with *donker*, but further explained by *zwart*) This general meaning appears to have existed formerly along with the usual, narrow one and is difficult to differentiate from it It continues to live in a few expressions even today ²³

This statement is quoted so fully because it seems to sum up the situation quite well and to be capable of extension, at least in part, to the conditions in German The existence of more such expressions in Dutch would indicate that *bruun* retained its older general meaning there longer than in German If this is true, then the Romanic use of the word *bruun* for the night and its phenomena may be expected to have found a readier entrance into Dutch than into German Its subsequent acceptance by the German Baroque poets was, as indicated, encouraged and made easier by the model in a sister tongue

In considering the reasons for the great vogue of this special device, the influence of painting (where the special effect of *chiar' oscuro* was being developed toward its ultimate perfection by Rembrandt) should not be disregarded Interesting too is the reflection of the actual colors in the Dutch term for this technique, it is *licht en bruun* as compared with the German *Helldunkel*

These remarks do not pretend to have demonstrated an absolute or exclusive influence on the part of the Dutch writers but to ascribe to them a contributory and exemplary influence The fixing of exact lines and directions of literary influence may never be possible for this remote and fluid period. Perhaps we shall be led to look to Holland, however, for the direct, contributory antecedents of those characteristics of the German Baroque which we have been wont to attribute directly to Italian and French sources.

STANLEY NEWMAN WERBOW

The Johns Hopkins University

²³ J. W. Muller and A. Kluyver, *Woordenboek der nederlandse Taal*, Leiden, 1902, III, pt 1, col. 1665 ff (translation mine)

MATHILDE HEINE'S ALBUM

Ernst Elster¹ describes in detail both the physical appearance and the contents of the autograph album belonging to Heinrich Heine's wife. As seen and examined by Elster, the book, bound in green velvet, had as its original entry, under date of 8 April 1847, verses by Heine beginning "Hier, auf gewalkten Lumpen, soll ich" (later incorporated into *Romanzero*, II under the title "In Mathildens Stammbuch"). Among other entries, Elster lists: Heinrich Laube, 11 April 1847, Heine's nephew, Ludwig Embden (undated), Alfred Meissner, 19 April 1847, Henri Seuffert, 22 Nov 1847, J Duesberg, 5 Sept 1848, J Karpeles, 7 Sept 1848, Ludwig Wihl, Nov 1849, Gérard de Nerval (undated), Alfred Michiels, 27 August 1852. The remaining pages were either left blank or bore autographed poems and music dated after the death of Heine. What catches the eye in Elster's description is his closing paragraph, he draws attention to "einen höchst auffälligen Bericht über Mathildens Album" by Alfred Meissner,² adding the admonition that a special investigation would need to be made before Meissner's "great errors" could be explained.³

If now we turn to an examination of the story under suspicion, we find it worthy of the characterization Meissner gave it "eine kleine Geschichte . . . scheinbar unbedeutend, in Wahrheit aber tief und schneidig, wie eine Romanszene."⁴ According to Meissner, Heine and Mathilde gave a gala dinner party for the express—or rather tacit—purpose of securing autographs for her album. When is this dinner supposed to have taken place? Here some momentary confusion creeps in. Meissner's phrase "um diese Zeit" is understood and interpreted by Houben as February or March of 1847; that is the dating assigned as a heading for the excerpted passage

¹ *Die Heine-Sammlung Strauß / Ein Verzeichnis*, privately printed, Marburg 1929, pages 13 and 14.

² *Schattentanz*, Zurich 1881. Elster cites vol II, pp 264-267. The original text was not accessible to me, for purposes of the present article, I have used passages from *Schattentanz* as reprinted by H. H. Houben *Gespräche mit Heine*, Frankfurt 1926.

³ In the same sense is Elster's earlier note concerning the "Stammbuch" poem in *Romanzero*: "Der Bericht Meißner . . . im einzelnen unrichtig" (*Heines Werke*², Leipzig 1924, II, 358).

⁴ Houben, *op cit*, p. 547.

from *Schattentanz* reprinted in the *Gesprache mit Heine*, after which an editorial note is appended by Houben, emending the date slightly ("die von Meißner geschilderte Gesellschaft fand jedenfalls Anfang März statt") and making specific reference to a letter of Heine's to Ferdinand Lasalle on the 27th of February 1847 [sic] ⁵ However, Houben is guilty of a clerical slip, the letter (mentioning a dinner to be given "in einigen Tagen," allegedly in honor of Lassalle's sister) was written a year earlier, 27th February 1846 ⁶ Further evidence speaks for this date and for some such party's having been planned, at the very least, if not given. For in the already cited letter to Lasalle Heine not only mentions Balzac, Royer, Gozlan, Gautier et al, as prospective guests, apparently on the very same day he addressed a letter to Balzac himself, inviting him to a dinner the following week, the evening of the 4th of March ⁷ So much for the date of this disputed party.

What dramatic or, to use Meissner's epithet, "novellistic" scene allegedly took place? After the dinner, the album went its rounds. Among the signers, Meissner mentions the critic and novelist Jules Janin, Hector Berlioz, and the writer Léon Gozlan, but the other names—Balzac, Gautier and the rest mentioned in Heine's two letters of the 27th of February—are conspicuously absent, likewise the persons whom Elster lists, with one possible exception. Alfred Meissner himself, whose autographed poem Elster catalogues as appearing on page 5 of the album in the Strauss collection. But was Meissner present at the "solemn occasion" he describes in his *Schattentanz*? In the first place, his entry in the green-velvet album bears the date of 19th April 1847 over a year later. Furthermore, he does not, in so many words, lay claim to having been an eye-witness. In a way, the tone of his narrative seems calculated to evoke that impression, yet he relays an account of the dénouement—after the guests had departed, when Heine and Mathilde discovered Gozlan's supposed insulting inscription—a scene at which he hardly could have been present. In fact, the degree

⁵ Houben, *op cit*, p. 549

⁶ Cf. *Heinrich Heines Briefwechsel*, hrsgg. v. Friedrich Hirth, München / Berlin, 1914-1920, vol. II (1917), pp. 592, 595. In a different context, Houben himself gives the date of the letter correctly *op cit*, p. 488.

⁷ Hirth, *op cit*, p. 592, the letter is merely dated "ce 27 février" but assigned by Hirth to [1846], apparently partially on the basis of the promise "Vous trouverez les amis Royer, Gozlan, les Escudier, Gautier."

of Meissner's intimate acquaintance with the Heine ménage would be sufficiently established by his mere knowledge of said dénouement. To be sure, Gozlan may, later on, have boasted openly that when it came his turn, he ("never banal, his words always hitting the mark," as Meissner says) wrote in his hostess' album "Il n'y a qu'un seul moyen de se défaire d'une vieille maîtresse. Il faut en faire sa femme." And this despite the fact that the ceremony in the church of St. Sulpice one August day in 1841 already lay four and a half years behind this deliberate insult.

When Heine and Mathilde discovered what trick had been played by their guest, they did not confine themselves, according to Meissner's account, to deleting the single page in question. "Das verdammte Buch in violettem [!] Samt mit dem schönen Goldschnitt und dem eleganten Schlosse! Heine riß sein Gedicht heraus und warf es in die Ecke. Doch er mochte es [das Buch] gar nicht im Hause haben. Als eine deutsche Freundin, die Autographen sammelte, nach Paris kam, wurde ihr das Buch geschenkt, nachdem alle deutschen Einschreibungen entfernt worden waren. Der Buchbinder hatte ihm wieder ein besseres Aussehen gegeben."⁸

What can be back of this story? It would seem fatuous to attribute the entirety to Meissner's imagination or to unreliable hearsay inaccurately reported. Even though Léon Gozlan was not present to deny the facts, having died in 1866, fifteen years before *Schattentanz* appeared, to be followed three years later by Hector Berlioz and still later, in 1874, by Janin, the story must have gained currency in their (and notably Gozlan's, the chief actor's) lifetime, and would have led to a *démenti* of some sort. Could Meissner have safely risked such denial, even in 1881, if his story had been without foundation? Balzac and Gautier, too, who may or may not have been present at the dinner, were dead. But Mathilde Heine was not, though in her middle sixties she may not have had a cavalier to refute the shadowy tale in *Schattentanz*, if, indeed, she ever heard of the book.

Still, there are several suspicious circumstances. Writing in the 1880's, had Meissner forgotten that he, too, had signed his name to a poem in Mathilde's album nearly thirty-five years before? Heine's poem, "In Mathildens Stammbuch," from *Romanzero*, is quoted, correctly and in full, in the episode recounted by Meissner. He remembered his first sight of it in the album. Did he forget that

⁸ Houben, *loc. cit.*

Heinrich Laube's name was already there before his own? Did he wonder at the absence of the names Janin, Berlioz, to say nothing of that gamin Gozlan? Or did he not hear of the Gozlan inscription and its consequences until some time, years perhaps, later? And was his memory in his late fifties hazy about the color of the velvet binding, which Elster assures us was green?

Without wishing to attach undue importance to such a small and subjective piece of evidence as the discrepancy between the green volume described by Elster and the violet binding remembered (?) by Meissner, nevertheless this clue implies a solution. Why does Meissner claim that all the *German* inscriptions were removed before the album was given away to "a friend"? What of the chief fly-in-the-ointment, Gozlan's French epigram? And does he mean, when he says that the bookbinder had given the album an improved appearance, that this book, torn apart on the very evening of its debut, the 4th of March 1846, or soon afterwards, was rebound between then and April of the next year, when he himself signed it?

Can we not find a much simpler and more nearly satisfying answer? In March of 1846 there was a dinner, partly or solely for the purpose of securing autographs for Mathilde's album, already bought in 1844.⁹ Balzac was invited, as Heine's letter proves, though there is no conclusive proof of his presence or absence, nor of that of Gautier and the others mentioned, except that very likely Léon Gozlan was on hand, and possibly Berlioz and Janin, as Meissner tells. The Gozlan incident occurred, the album was disposed of, and has since, to all intents and purposes, disappeared. Whether the velvet of its binding had actually been violet or not, it was replaced by a green velvet-bound substitute, into which Heine himself, outwardly undaunted, again wrote the first entry—the same poem, beginning "Hier, auf gewalkten Lumpen, soll ich," which had graced the original album and which he now redated 8 April 1847. The sole rational explanation for the existing confusion must be the succession, possibly the co-existence of *two* albums,¹ i. e. the story of giving the original album away may or may not have been a subterfuge on Heine's and his wife's part. Must we leave this affair, as "The Mystery of the Missing Album"? Whether, in addition to the one in the Strauss collection as catalogued by Ernst Elster, another album will come to light in some

⁹ Cf. Heine to his mother, 17 October 1844, Hirth, *op. cit.*, II, 519

collection of Heineana yet to be catalogued,¹⁰ is rather a matter for conjecture than for dogmatic prediction

HERMAN SALINGER

Grinnell College

EIN BERLINER 'SPERL' BEI FONTANE

In einer Gesprächsszene, deren eigentlicher Zweck charakterisierend ist, lässt Fontane im achten Kapitel des Berliner Gesellschaftsromans *Frau Jenny Treibel* den Kellner u. a. folgende Worte an den jungen Leopold Treibel richten. "Ja, Herr Treibel, als die Frau Mama vorgestern hier waren und der Herr Kommerzienrat auch, und auch das Gesellschaftsfraulein, und Sie, Herr Leopold, eben nach dem *Sperl* und dem Karussell gegangen waren, da hat mir die Mama gesagt 'Hören Sie, Mutzell, ich weiss, er kommt beinahe jeden Morgen, und ich mache Sie verantwortlich. eine Tasse, nie mehr.'"¹ Dem Namen nach konnte dieser Mutzell² vielleicht aus Süddeutschland stammen, aber der durch den Namen angedeutete Begriff eines untersetzten Menschen passt kaum zu Fontanes Bild der äusseren Erscheinung "ein auf sich haltender Mann von Mitte der Vierzig, der schon in den Vormittagsstunden einen beinahe fleckenlosen Frack trug" Erst recht die Sprache des Kellners, die sonst von einigen berlinisch-maikischen Ausdrücken angehaucht ist, schliesst die Vermutung fremder Herkunft aus.³ Wie kommt aber Fontane dazu, einem Berliner Kellner

¹⁰ Professor Walter Wadepuhl of Elmhurst College, author of numerous articles on Heine, to whom I have communicated the foregoing chain of deduction, informs me that it is more than likely that a second (first!) album actually exists in the collection, now inaccessible in a sealed vault in New York City, formerly belonging to the late Eric Benjamin. Does the above article supply, so to speak, an explanation in advance and a quasi-vindication of Alfred Meissner?

¹ Theodor Fontane, *Gesammelte Werke* Berlin 1905 OS 1 Serie, Bd 8, 117

² Vgl. Heintze Cascorbi, *Die deutschen Familiennamen* 6. Aufl. Halle 1926, 285. Mutz III (alem.) ein untersetzter Mensch (schweizer Mutsch, Motsch "Dickkopf"). Auch Mutsch, Mitsch, Motsch. Verkleinerungsform Mutzel.

³ Vom historischen Standpunkt aus glaubt Professor Richard Salomon (Kenyon College), dass die Wurzeln des Namens 'Mutzell' vielleicht in Fontanes frühen Erinnerungen zu suchen sind. Im Jahre 1850 kam es nämlich, so mehr aus Versehen, zu einem kleinen Zusammenstoss von preus-

ein ans Bayrisch-österreichische anklingendes Wort *Sperl* in den Mund zu legen?

Ohne Zweifel handelt es sich hier um *Sperl*⁴ im Sinne von "Tanzsaal," wie das Wort in der österreichischen, bezw. Wiener Dichtung, hauptsächlich bei Nestroy und Raimund vorkommt⁵. In deren Posen bezieht sich *Sperl* auf ein populäres Lokal im zweiten Wiener Gemeindebezirk, von welchem Glassbrenner eine für ihn charakteristische Beschreibung in *Bilder und Traume aus Wien*⁶ bietet

Das Fest im Sperl war reizend. Wie eine Weihnachtspyramide sahen die Sale und die uppgen Baume mit ihren tausend Lampen aus. An jedem Tische wurde gegessen und getrunken, nicht einer von den Hunderten, auf welchem nicht Teller klapperten und das Messer- und Gabelspiel producirt wurde. Strauss spielte, und sobald er endigte, regnete ein endloser Beifall auf den belorbeernten Kopf. Hinten trieb der Polichinell seine Spasse, und für unerleuchtete Gartenparthien, in welchen die Seufzer der Liebe sich

sischen und österreichischen Stieitkrafen, der sogenannten 'Schlacht bei Bronzell'. Die Opfer waren auf preussischer Seite ein Schimmel und der Stiefelabsatz des Gefierten *Mutzel*. Das Unternehmen ist in einem Leerkastenlied verewigt, worn es heisst

Der arme Schimmel musste sterben,
Dass sich die Preussen Ruhm erwerben

Bei Fontanes bekannter Souveranität in der Namenswahl wäre es leicht möglich, wenn auch nicht beweisbar, dass der Gefreite, bewusst oder unbewusst, der heimliche Taufpate des Kellners ist.

⁴ Dass das bayrisch-österreichische *Sperl* Stecknadel, Tannennadel kaum in Betracht kame, lässt sich aus Schmeller *Wb* II 681 schnell ermitteln. Auch Paul Kretschmer, *Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache*, Göttingen 1918 führt nur die eine Bedeutung an.

⁵ F. H. Mautner erklärt auf S. 490 seiner Nestroy-Ausgabe das Wort *Sperl* als "Name eines beliebten Tanzlokals." *Ausgewählte Werke* Wien 1938. In Nestroys *Eine Wohnung ist zu vermieten* II, 17 heisst es: "Ich hab' vor einigen Jahren einen Heuschreck kennt, er war Lederermeister in der Leopoldstadt in der kleinen Schiffgassen, das dritte Haus, eh' man zum Sperl hintri geht," — Raimund, *Der Barometermacher auf der Zauberinsel* II, 10: "Da kehr'n wir beim Sperl in Afrika ein." Ferdinand Raimund, *Sämtliche Werke*, Leipzig 1903, herausg. von Eduard Castelle. Anm. S. 48: *Sperl*—Vergnugungsort in der Leopoldstadt.—Fr. Th. Vischer, *Faust. Der Tragödie dritter Teil* I 6 (Mephistopheles mit den Seligen Knaben): "Der Hexentanz, was für ein Schmaus! / Es war so munter wie in Wien beim Sperl, / Und damals, ja, war Faust ein andrer Kerl!" *Werke* 4 Bd. Leipzig 1917, 29.

⁶ Glassbrenner, Adolf, *Bilder und Traume aus Wien* Leipzig 1836 Bd. II, 136.

wie Thau auf die Blumenkelche legten, war ebenfalls Sorge getragen Hier lauter wilder Jubel, dort stille Liebe und susse Erhorung Und alle die gluhenden Funken des Herzens sammelten sich, denn auf demselben Orte briannte gegen Mitternacht ein Feuerwerk ab Oben in den Salen war Ball Die Lust wahrte bis drei Uhr morgens O gluckliches, lustiges Wien! ⁷

Obwohl sich in Fontanes *Plaudereien ubers Theater* nur eine einzige Besprechung findet, die auf Vertrautheit mit den Oesterreichern schliessen lasst, eine Kritik von Raimunds *Der Verschwender*, muss er als Theaterkritiker diese gekannt haben. Aber selbst dann und auch bei seiner bekannten Bevorzugung des Fremdsprachlichen, fragt es sich, ob ein Fontane aus bloss literarischer Kenntnis her das Nomen *Sperl* so spezifisch angewendet hatte, wie das an der zitierten Stelle der Fall ist Unseres Wissens hat das Wort keine Aufnahme in die Berliner Umgangssprache gefunden ⁸ Daher darf man wohl in diesem Ausdruck hochstens einen Hinweis auf den Berliner Rahmen sehen, auf ein Stucklein Alltagsleben, das dem Schriftsteller, als er sich 1888-1892 mit der *Treibel* beschafftigt, zur genaueren Abschilderung der Wirklichkeit dient. Leopold und Mutzell unterhalten sich namlich fast jeden Morgen zur fruhen Stunde in einem Treptower Restaurant, das Fontane als 'Etablissement' bezeichnet, wohl zur Andeutung, dass es nicht allein ein beliebtes, sondern auch ein grosses Lokal ist Da der junge Treibel 'eben' nach dem Sperl und dem Karussell gegangen ist, lasst sich wohl annehmen, dass diese in der Nahe liegen

Tatsachlich existierte auch einst ein Berliner Sperl, ein Lokal aber, das viel spater als der Wiener Sperl ins Leben getreten sein muss Denn weder Adolph Brenglas (Adolf Glassbrenner) mit seinen Berliner "Strassenbildern," die die Stadt am Abend be-

⁷ Im Jahre 1862 wird Hebbel, der sich in Dresden aufhielt, durch einen dortigen Konzertsaal an den Wiener Sperl erinnert und schreibt an seine Frau "Nach Tisch setzte ich mich in einen Omnibus und fuhr in's Linksche Bad, wo Abends um 6 Uhr ein Concert stattfinden sollte und wo ich noch nie war, Entié 5 Silber-Groschen Es ist ein Local, wie der Wiener Sperl, wer baden will, kann in die Elbe springen, wenn es die Polizei gestattet, von anderen Vorkehrungen bin ich nichts gewahr geworden" In *Samtliche Werke*, hrsg von R. M. Werner, Berlin 1901/07, Serie 3, Bd 7, 247

⁸ Nicht angefuhrht bei H. Brendicke, "Der Berliner Volksdialekt," *Schriften des Vereins fur die Geschichte Berlins* xxiv, xxxii (1892 ab), "Berliner Wortschatz zu den Zeiten Kaiser Wilhelms I", ebd xxxiii, A. Lasch, "Berlinsch" *Eine berlinsche Sprachgeschichte*, Berlin 1929, Hans Meyer, *Der richtige Berliner in Wortern und Redensarten* 6 Aufl Berlin 1904

schreiben,⁹ noch Friedrich Holtze, der öffentliche Vergnügungen aus der Periode 1840-1860 anführt,¹⁰ erwähnen einen solchen Vergnügungsort.¹¹ Erst in einem Führer durch die Umgebung Berlins, den Fontanes Verlegersohn Friedrich 1894 veröffentlicht hat, kommt man darauf.¹² In einer Aufzählung der Treptower Lokale heisst es

Zu Linken der Strasse liegen, bis zum Spreeufer durchgehend, nebeneinander Restaurant Ackemann, Restaurant C Monch, vormals W Eichbaum, Riemers Restaurant, *Paradiesgarten* (früher *Sperl*, Wirt war Otto Buchholz), hier ist für allerlei Kurzweil gesorgt, der Eiffelturm, etwa 30 m hoch, bietet gute Feinsicht, ein reizender Kaiserpavillon ladet zum Genuß von Wein und echtem Bier ein, Turnplatz, Orchesterhalle, Unterhaltungsboden, Schaukel, Marionettentheater sind vorhanden.¹³

Dorthin flüchtet sich nun der leichtlebige Leopold vor der nagelnden Mama, wenn er mit Eltern und Gesellschaftsfraulein ins Treptower Restaurant muss.

Ob noch andere norddeutsche Städte in den Jahren 1860-1890 einen solchen *Sperl* aufzuweisen hatten? Schon der eine Vers des Barometermachers in der jauchzenden Raimund-Szene¹⁴ "Da kehrt'n wir beim Sperl in Afrika ein" lässt vermuten, dass bis 1823 die Popularität des Wiener Lokals Anlass zu komischer Übertreibung werden konnte. Der Mann, dessen Unternehmungsgeist solche Massen-Kurzweil ins Leben gerufen hatte, hiess nicht einmal Sperl, sondern *Sperlbauer*. Nachdem aber dieser Johann Georg Sperlbauer, Jäger und Bürger, 1701 ein Hauschen erworben hatte und die dort errichtete Gaststätte volkstümlich geworden war, hat er den Namen abgekürzt. Das Wirtshaus führte immer noch das Schild. Zum Sperlbauer, wonach auch heute die Strasse, an der

⁹ Brenglas, Adolph, *Berlin, wie es ist—und trinkt* 2. Aufl. Leipzig 1842

11 Heft, S. 12-13

¹⁰ Holtze, Friedrich, "Bilder aus Berlin vor zwei Menschenaltern" in *Schriften des Vereins für die Geschichte Berlins*, xxxv (1898), 67-123

¹¹ In den Berliner Adressbüchern wird kein Restaurateur Sperl in Treptow aufgeführt. 1850-1884 taucht mehrmals ein A. Sperle als Restaurateur an verschiedenen Adressen auf, immer aber entweder in den "Zelten" (also Tiergarten) oder in der inneren Stadt. (Mitgeteilt von Stadtarchivdirektor Dr. Ernst Kaebler, Berlin.)

¹² *Führer durch die Umgebung von Berlin*. Herausgegeben vom Touristenklub für die Mark Brandenburg. Berlin 1894, 1. Teil, Osten, S. 12

¹³ Auch von Stadtarchivdirektor Kaebler mitgeteilt

¹⁴ Vgl. oben Anm. 5

es lag, Sperlgasse heisst Erst Therese Sperlbauer, eine Enkelin des Grunders, und deren Mann, Johann Scherzer, erweiterten den Besitz durch Ankauf von Nachbarhauschen und Garten und eröffneten dort 1807 eine Gaststätte mit grossem Garten und Tanzsaal, wie Glassbrenner ihn beschreibt Um die Vierziger Jahre geriet das Lokal in schlechten Ruf, wurde von der "guten Gesellschaft" gemieden und ging in den Siebziger Jahren ganz ein¹⁵ Wer aber weiss die Kluft zu überbrücken, die den heruntergekommenen Wiener Vergnugungsort von dem Treptower Sperl, Inhaber Otto Buchholz, etwa Mitte der Achtziger Jahre, trennt?

MYRA R. JESSEN

Bryn Mawr College

LESSING'S *FAUST* FRAGMENT AND *ROMEO AND JULIET*

In the "Geisterschau" of his *Faust Fragment*¹ Lessing, attempting to discover the swiftest spirit, introduces seven "Geister der Holle" Dismissing the first demon, Faust commands²

"Fahre *siebenmal eben so schnell* durch die *Flammen der Holle*"

Lessing's third spirit says

"Mich tragen die *Flugel der Winde*"

The fourth informs Faust

"Ich fahre auf den *Strahlen des Lichtes*"

The fifth entreats Faust who is provoked by the preceding spirits, "deren Schnelligkeit in endlichen Zahlen auszudrücken (ist)"

"Würdige sie meines Unwillens nicht Sie sind nur *Satans*

¹⁵ Nach Wilhelm Kisch, *Die alten Strassen und Plätze der Leopoldstadt* Wien 1885 Herr Th. Feldmann, dem ich den Hinweis auf dieses Werk verdanke, weiss vom weiteren Schicksal des Lokals, dass die Commune Wien die Grundstücke zum Errichten von zwei Schulgebäuden erworben hatte Von diesen hiess das Realgymnasium Erzherzog Rainer bei den Studenten immer noch 'Sperl'

¹ Dritte Scene des zweyten Aufzugs Cf *Lessings sammtliche Schriften*, Lachmann-Muncker (III, 382-3) The Faust scene is from *Briefe, die neueste Litteratur betreffend*, VII, d 16, Feb 1759 (Lachmann-Muncker, VIII, 44)

² Italics and parenthesis mine Note Both Juliet and Faust are lamenting the slowness of corporeal messengers

Bothen in der Körperwelt," and adds, that he, the fifth, is "so schnell als die Gedanken des Menschen"

In Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* (II, v) the heroine exclaims³

*Love's heralds should be thoughts,
Which ten times faster glide than the sun's beams
Driving black shadows over louring hills
Therefore do nimble-pinioned doves draw Love,
And therefore hath the wind swift Cupid wings*

That Lessing should use with such concentration the identical metaphorical media to indicate speed as are found in this short Shakespearean passage might be entirely coincidental, but that the same three examples employed in Juliet's lament should occur in the "Geisterschau" in direct juxtaposition and in an order which is the exact reverse of that used by Shakespeare is noteworthy. Especially is this so since considerable search has failed to discover in any of the "speed demon" scenes in various treatments of the Faust saga any instance in which the same examples are used in the same sequence as that employed in Lessing's scene.

The coincidence becomes all the more noteworthy when we recall that, immediately before introducing this famous scene in the "17 Litteraturbrief"⁴ with the statement that "Doktor Faust hat eine Menge Szenen, die nur ein Shakespearisches Genie zu denken vermögen gewesen," Lessing had terminated his vigorous praise of Shakespeare by referring to *Othello*, *Leas*, *Hamlet*, "etc.,"⁵ and, finally, by comparing *Othello* with Voltaire's *Zaïre*. One of the few other Shakespearean dramas with which Lessing was acquainted

³ Schlegel's translation, though of later date than the Lessing fragment, is an example of the words likely to be called forth in the German mind by Shakespeare's lines

*Zu Liebesboten taugen nur Gedanken,
Die zehnmal schneller fliehn als Sonnenstrahlen,
Wenn sie die Nacht von finstern Hügeln scheuchen
Deswegen ziehn ja leichtbeschwingte Tauben
Der Liebe Wagen, und Cupido hat windschnelle Flügel*

Compare passages where I indicate emphasis, especially "Liebesboten" (Lessing's "Satans Bothen"), English "heralds". In comparing "siebenmal" with Shakespeare's "ten times" note that the mystic, perfect number *Seven* is more appropriate to Lessing's "Geisterschau" and note also that the scene is entitled "Faust und sieben Geister". For a German translation almost coeval with Lessing's scene see below, note No. 9.

⁴ Lachmann-Muncker, VIII, 41 ff

⁵ The sign for "etc" is Lessing's, *loc cit*, p. 43

was *Romeo and Juliet*.⁶ This acquaintance is manifested in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*,⁷ where in criticizing *Zaire*, Lessing writes "Ich kenne nur eine Tragödie, an der die Liebe selbst arbeiten helfen, und das *Romeo und Juliet*, vom Shakespeare"

This brief statement justifies Vail's statement⁸ "We cannot tell the source of his knowledge of *Romeo and Juliet*," and causes us to wonder whether the "etc" just mentioned, coming as it does at the conclusion of the lists of names of Shakespeare's tragedies, and immediately before the mention of *Zaire*, might indicate that Lessing knew *Romeo and Juliet* at that time,⁹ and thus strengthen our suspicion that the similarity which the elements in the "Geisterschau" bear to the characteristics pointed out in Juliet's lament might be more than coincidental

It is certain that the indicated coincidences in the thought, the figurative language and the sequence of occurrence of the metaphors represent a closer approximation of the Lessing passage to the English version of *Romeo and Juliet* than it does to the earliest, and practically contemporary, German translation of that play.¹⁰ Consequently, it does not seem too rash to suggest that Lessing had some direct knowledge of Shakespeare's Juliet when he wrote the famous scene of his *Faust Fragment*.

JOHN T. KRUMPELMANN

Louisiana State University

⁶ Cf F W Meinest, "Shakespeare and Lessing" *PMLA*, xix, 2, 234-46

⁷ 15 Stück d 19 Junius, 1767, Lachmann Muncker, ix, 243 f

⁸ Curtis C D Vail, *Lessing's Relations to the English Language and Literature*, Columbia University Press, 1936, p 179

⁹ Cf Meinest, *op cit*, p 240 "In the wide range of discussions of every phase of drama, Lessing finds occasion to refer to only five of Shakespeare's tragedies *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Richard III*." On this basis the "etc" could only refer to one of the two last named plays. But we know that Lessing had some cognizance of at least some other Shakespearean plays. Cf Vail, *op cit*, p 219 f

¹⁰ *Die erste deutsche Romeo-Uebersetzung*, reprint with introduction and commentary by Ernest H Mensel *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, xiv, Nos 3-4, April-July, 1933. The following passage is quoted from this translation of 1758 (Basel) for comparison with the passages from Shakespeare and Lessing introduced above

Es sollten *Liebesboten Gedanken* seyn, die zehnmal hurt'ger sind als *Sonnenstrahlen*, wenn sie über Berge, die ganz umnebelt sind, die Schatten jagen. Man schickte dessentwegen Liebesbriefe Durch Tauben, welche *schnellbeflügelt* sind, und darum hat der Gott der Liebe Flügel

GRILLPARZER'S SELF-IDENTIFICATION WITH
ROUSSEAU¹

Morbid self-analysis and bitter self-criticism occur frequently in Grillparzer's diaries. In his apparent determination to leave no shred of his personality inviolate, he attacks even such inconsequential and extraneous factors as his own name, the sight and sound of which filled him with exaggerated horror.² Now and then he ironically refers to himself as Fixlmullner, a name which he obviously chose both for its rhythmic and structural correspondence to his own and for its clumsy and slightly ludicrous quality. A journal entry from the year 1812 reads in part as follows:

Ich bin nun überzeugt, sprach Fixlmullner, dass ich keine Anlage zum Dichter habe. Keine Originalität, wenn auch nicht gestohlene Ausdrücke doch zusammengestoppelte Gedanken. Wenn Goethe, Schiller und Shakespeare über mich einen Konkurs eröffneten ich müsste affenkahl dastehen. Hm, versetzte Hopmeier. Kannst du noch zweifeln? sprach Hanns Jakob Rousseau und setzte seine *Confessions* also fort. Ich habe zu früh und zu viel gelesen. Ich habe mir mit köstlichen Speisen den jungen Magen überladen und muss sie nun in Unath verwandelt, von mir geben. Ich verspüre manchmal ein *deficit* an Verstand und dennoch bin ich zu klug, verständig mag und muss der Dichter seyn aber ums Himmelswillen nicht zu klug.³

August Sauer remarks in reference to this passage, "Unter Fixlmullner versteht Grillparzer sich selbst, unter Hopmeier oder Hopsmann und Rousseau vielleicht seine Freunde."⁴ It seems clear, however, that Fixlmullner and Hanns Jakob Rousseau are one and the same person, and that Grillparzer's use of the latter name is simply a further gibe at himself and at his propensity for self-revelation. A careful reading of the passage cannot fail to indicate

* All references are to Franz Grillparzer *Samtliche Werke*, historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe, 2. Abteilung *Tagebücher und literarische Skizzenhefte*.

¹ Cf. *Tagebücher* II, 322, No. 1673. "Die ihm angeborne Rede- und Menschenscheu ward in seiner Jugend auch noch dadurch gehegt und verstärkt. Erstens, dass er einen Widerwillen gegen den Klang seines Namens hatte, und in die größte Verlegenheit gerathen konnte, wenn ihn jemand bei demselben nannte, oder wohl gar nach seinem Namen fragte. (Gedruckt hat er ihn noch lange nachher nicht sehen und lesen können)." and *Tagebücher* III, 49, No. 1936. "Der verfluchte Name hat mich immer geärgert."

² *Tagebücher* I, 76, No. 168.

³ *Ibid.*, 391.

this fact Grillparzer states that Hanns Jakob Rousseau *continues* his confessions, it is Fixlmullner who has been confessing, and the mention of continuance establishes the identification. Furthermore, the confessions of Hanns Jakob Rousseau-Fixlmullner are reminiscent of previous entries in which Grillparzer mentions his own early extensive and indiscriminate reading⁴ and in which he censures himself for lack of originality⁵.

On other occasions, too, Grillparzer draws parallels between himself and Rousseau, sometimes in so many words, sometimes by inference. The frankest of these admissions occurs in the diary of 1822: "Ich lese Rousseaus *Confessions* und erschrecke darin mich selbst zu sehen"⁶. Shortly thereafter he comments again: "Rousseaus Neigung zur Lüge (Verlegenheits- und Ausschmückungs-Lüge) ist jener Person auch nicht fremd,"⁷ concerning which Sauer remarks, "Grillparzer meint offenbar sich selbst"⁸. The poet had previously claimed mendacity as one of his vices: "Ich *lüge*, und nicht etwa des Scherzes willen, nein es ist Neigung, Wohlgefallen an der Lüge"⁹. Grillparzer accuses Rousseau of egoism: "Wie wurde sich Rousseau gewundert haben, wenn ihn jemand den vollkommensten Egoisten genannt hatte, der jemals gelebt?"¹⁰. Later he describes himself as a "Geistes- und Gemüths-Egoist."¹¹

Thus Grillparzer discerns, however reluctantly, a resemblance between himself and Rousseau, for whom he expresses a contempt which he frequently feels also for himself.

In the light of the above, it appears that Sauer erred in his assertion that Grillparzer, in the first-cited journal entry, is using the name Hanns Jakob Rousseau for one of his friends. Grillparzer is here indulging in a double alias. Hanns Jakob Rousseau is Fixlmullner, Fixlmullner is Grillparzer.

PATRICIA DRAKE

University of Texas

⁴ *Ibid.*, 28, No. 56

⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, 30, No. 59: "Meine Nachahmungssucht übersteigt allen Glauben. Alle meine Ideen formen sich nach jungst gelesenen."

⁶ *Tagebücher* II, 9, No. 991

⁷ *Ibid.*, 23, No. 1047

⁸ *Ibid.*, 392

⁹ *Tagebücher* I, 7, No. 17

¹⁰ *Tagebücher* II, 53, No. 1115

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 297, No. 1627

IDEOLOGICAL ANTECEDENTS OF THE *BROTHERS*
KARAMASOV

Since all of Dostoyevski's previous literary endeavors found their synthetization in his last novel, the influences that entered into his early works also affect the ultimate creation. Suffice it to say that Swift's "Gulliver's Travels" appears on the first page of "The Demons", that Abbé Prévost's "Manon Lescaut" is significantly alluded to in "The Gambler", and that the *Tales* of the fantastic German romantic E. T. A. Hoffmann are mentioned with especial emphasis in "The Humiliated and Offended" as a motif to which Dostoyevski is indebted.

Aside from the literary factors, there was a strictly non-literary and personal event in Dostoyevski's life which played a paramount causal role in the inception of a plan for the central plot of *Bratya Karamázovy*, an encounter that occurred approximately a hundred years ago, around 1850, in a Siberian penal colony, between Dostoyevski and a fellow convict who was accused of having murdered his rich old father. True, Ilyinski, the killer-suspect, could not be convicted of patricide and had to be released from the penitentiary, but the very possibility, the psychologically conceivable probability of such a crime stirred and haunted Dostoyevski's imagination so vehemently and persistently that he decided to make it the fundamental subject and crucial event of a narrative. (See D's journals)

Sharpened and heightened, the life-long preoccupations of Dostoyevski's former novels converge in his climactic epic. *The Brothers Karamasov* unites most of the author's foregoing meditations and reflexions on such moral and social types as the debauchee, the self-depraved, promiscuous women, the *bourgeoise hystérique*, chaste hermit and beautiful soul, the unbridled Russian nature, young rebels in "nietzschean" revolt, patriarchal sages, and virtuosos of so-called justice.

Exactly a century after the appearance of Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber*, the cardinal motif of this drama reappeared, in 1880, in Dostoyevski's last novel. He affirmed that the "Robbers" had been a great inspiration to him, that they had provided him with the archetypes after which he patterned the characters and the ideology of the *Brothers Karamasov*. In it is revived the entire theme of the German dramatist: a wealthy, domineering father, rival

brothers, concupiscence and cupidity Dostoyevski makes the analogy even more striking by having Fyodr Pávlovitch Karamasov identify himself with the "Regierender Graf von Moor," while his sons Iván and Dimítri are introduced, verbatim, by the name of Karl and Franz Moor, the leading personages of *Die Rauber*. Dostoyevski makes it very plain how much he owes to Schiller, how intimately he modeled his Russian protagonists after the *dramatis personae* of the iconoclastic German tragedy

Ever since his adolescence Dostoyevski was so fascinated by the refined and psychic methods of homicide as practised in the *Robbers* that he transferred them, *telles quelles*, into the *Brátya Karamázovy*. The procedure and the result of the Russian murderer's machinations are identical with those of his German precursor not physical, but moral and emotional torture proves to be deadly. It is the venom of words, not of poison, with which the jealous son kills the despotic Karamasov *père*, the same subtle and insidious means by which Franz breaks the life of his father, the old tyrant Moor. Dostoyevski's hero covets the same gain as Schiller's access to the inheritance and to his relative's bride-to-be by eliminating the competitor thru paternal curse and ostracism. Behind this parable, of course, looms the problem of Human Freedom.

Dostoyevski was an ardent admirer of the genius of George Sand. In his "Diary of a Writer" he published a glowing and worshipful obituary, proclaiming this French authoress the greatest *femme de lettres* of the century. He read avidly all of her books, including, no doubt, *Spiridion*, her little-known philosophical novel. Large sections of *Brothers Karamasov* are essentially influenced by the guiding ideas and situations of *Spiridion*. The parallelisms are striking. Here are several themes of George Sand which Dostoyevski reelaborates in this crowning work. The hero Alexéy-Alyosha (namesake of *Spiridion's* Alexis), and also a recluse, is engaged in a critique of catholicism against the backdrop of utopian socialism of the 1840's. Taken up anew by the Russian is the Frenchwoman's presentation of the controversy between Christianity and *fourérisme*. Other motifs transposed from *Spiridion* into *Brátya Karamázovy* are submission to ecclesiastic dogmatism and "heretical" striving for individual liberty of thought and conscience, the conflict between faith, agnosticism and atheism, redemption thru irrational mystical beliefs and the soteriologic virtues of positivist science and skepticism, the monk who leaves his cell to fight the

people's battle against the corrupted power of the Church of Rome, and storms the barricades in the name of world-wide liberty, equality, and fraternity. From the theological-political perspective of that French novel Dostoyevski derives religious metaphysics and a socio-governmental ideology which deviate from those of George Sand and even oppose them diametrically.

In *Spiridon*, both State and Church are doomed to extinction. In the *Brothers Karamasov*, however, the victory of the political revolution is only temporary and is not followed by anarchy. The secular power will be absorbed by a theocracy, an omnipotent and supreme "Ekklesia" which will entail not only a cessation of the revolt against the Heavenly Father, the King in Heaven, but also a logical discontinuance of the horrible patricidal rebellion against the Father of the Country, the Tzar, the beloved *pater patriae* or "Bátyushka". The private parricide in the *Brátya Karamazovy* symbolizes the assassinations of the autocratic rulers of the Romanov dynasty, committed by members of the anarchistic school of thought. Their nihilistic and irreverent ideology leads inevitably towards perdition and utter crime, and Dostoyevski illustrates this conviction of his thru the person of the young Karamasov, whose blasphemousness makes him become a killer.

In one of Dostoyevski's letters to his publisher we can see this particular ideological impulse that determined some didactic features of his last novel. The author states that one of the purposes of *Brothers Karamasov* is to be a poignant instrument of political education with which to help discredit and crush the "pernicious movement" of anarchism. If his novel should have this effect, Dostoyevski would consider it a civic, humanitarian, and world-historic achievement of the very first order.

Reading a novelette by his revered teacher, Honoré de Balzac, also helped Dostoyevski to crystallize the plot of *Brátya Karamázovy*. The influential book was Balzac's "conte policier" entitled *L'Auberge Rouge*. In this suspenseful mystery-story Dostoyevski finds paradigms for the typical actions and motives of the Karamasov brothers. It will be remembered that the author of *La Comédie Humaine* lodged two French army surgeons overnight in a hostelry room, together with a rich German banker. Both officers conceive the idea of killing the senescent, selfish, obnoxious hoarder of riches, thus enabling them to take possession of the monopolist's gold, the key to life-fulfilment. But they do not dis-

close their plans to each other. One of the officers falls asleep during his gory and sinister scheming, while the other surgeon performs the homicide with his lancets and makes his get-away with the money-bags of the venerable, yet deeply detested German miser. When the unsuspecting would-be murderer is found in the morning next to the *corpus delicti*, the beheaded body of the old tycoon, all the evidence is against him, and the innocent one is convicted of the crime. One sees the relation between the *Karamasov* plot and this rather simple French intrigue.

It may prove enlightening to ascertain how the ideological filiation of Dostoyevski's earlier writings, how his preceding meditations and aspirations converged upon and in the *Brátya Karamázovy*, how they determined the various themes which distinguish his last creation.

In the late 1860's (right after the completion of the *Idiot*) and again in 1870 Dostoyevski wrote from Florence, Italy, to his friend, the littérateur Maikov in Moscow, declaring his intention to compose a prose monument that would match L. Tolstoi's "War and Peace," whose title was to be *Atheism or the Life of a Great Sinner*, a grand epic novel intended to amalgamate Dostoyevski's philosophical quests and observations as they had accumulated thru the years. This *capolavoro*, however, never materialized in the proposed form. Instead, Dostoyevski produced three separate, different novels which show a progressive unfolding of ideas originally meant to be contained in a single book. The three novels among which "Atheism" was, as it were, distributed, are *Demons* (*Byéssy*, 1871-72), *The Adolescent* (*Podróstok*, '75), and at last the *Brothers Karamazov* ('79-80), the final opus, the fruition of his whole existence, written under the lengthening shadows of his approaching death.

The ideas and motifs jotted down for the never-composed *Atheism* find a fragmentary and intermittent treatment in "The Demons" and the "Adolescent." But all those preoccupations that had haunted Dostoyevski since the planning of *A Great Sinner* reach finally their fullest expression, embodiment and dénouement in the *Brátya Karamázovy*, which became something like a substitution for the opus whose primary title was to have been *Atheism*. Its salient themes, as revealed by Dostoyevski's ultimate *roman*, can be formulated as follows. Question as to the existence of God and the Devil, republic (democracy) and monarchy

(autocracy), Occident, Russia, and Orient, mentality and soul-life of children, the abused child, juvenile delinquency and disgruntled, alienated youthful criminals, the problem of step-parents and orphans. Other important subjects are the utopia of a blameless society of the future, Marxian communism, the *Commune* of Paris (1871), the vandalistic extermination of the legacies of free minds by an anti-intellectual "Kultur-Barbarei"—a façade for anarchy.

Among the sketches for the novel *Podróstok* ("Adolescent") we already find a preliminary wording of the pessimistic cosmic vision which is later so amply orchestrated and dramatized by the chapter of the "Great Inquisitor" in the *Karamasovs* the three universal temptations so shrewdly placed before Jesus by Satan on the promontory of Jerusalem, and which Dostoyevski's genius interpreted as the all-pervading principle of the history of mankind throughout the ages, as humanity's perpetual sell-out of personal spiritual freedom for the sake of daily bread and provisional social security.

There are five of Dostoyevski's novels, each of which is a continuation of the preceding one as to the development of the ideological contents, and which form a perfect continuity in this respect. The titles, in their chronological order, are *Crime and Punishment* ("Prestupléníye i Nakazániye"), 1866, *The Idiot*, '68, *Demons* (Byéssí), '71, *The Adolescent* (Podróstok), '75, *The Brothers Karamasov* (Brátya Karamázovy), '79-80. These five books represent an informal and loose, yet consistent and spiritually homogeneous sequence that gives the impression of a "roman-fleuve" and might, with some justification, be called a *pentalogy*. In it Dostoyevski unfolds the enigma of conscience between good and evil, of life's meaning or absurdity, and expounds his historical credo concerning the moral fiber of the Russians. To denote his conception of a particular facet in their national psychology and character he coined a term which has become part and parcel of the Russian everyday vocabulary *karamázovshchina*. This term designates a Karamazov-like type of people who tend to resort to violent, tempestuous or morbid solutions in their desperate attempt to unravel the maze of Right and Wrong. Dostoyevski feared that the dizziness, extremism, unbridledness and mental mutiny of the "karamázovshchina" might jeopardize, pervert or prostitute what he still believes to be Russia's divine mission as Christendom's chosen people.

In 1876, one year after the publication of *Podróstok* (The Adolescent), a memento in Dostoyevski's notebook tells of his design to compose a novel entitled *Besporyadok* (Disorder), another never-to-be-written book. It would have focussed the general ethical-intellectual confusion of Russian society, the decay of the family and the chaos of convictions among the ruling classes. The author is afraid that this axiological disequilibrium will facilitate the intrusion of alien tables of values from the West which are apt to undermine and dissolve the politico-religious-hieratic myth of a Holy Russia, the unique sanctity of "Svyatáya Rusj." Dostoyevski's outlook on Russian civilization of his time, intended to appear in the unwritten novel *Disorder* ("Besporiádok"), can be detected only three or four years later, almost verbatim, in the teleological goal of all his antecedent ideologies *The Brothers Karamasov*.

Both the factual Ilyitch incident and the fictional Karamasovs typify the fading and unraveling culture gobelin of a groping Russia under the ancien régime. "Multiply the four main characters of my novel by one thousand," Dostoyevski writes to his publisher, "and you get the intelligentsia of our Russia of today." The luminous examples of Balzac's *The Human Comedy* and of *War And Peace* cannot be ignored, they suggest themselves plainly in this context.

The Muscovite occidentalists dubbed Dostoyevski "chauvinist" because he refused to see the Slavic world all black and the rest of Europe all white. We have just seen to what large extent Dostoyevski consciously and persistently espoused the thoughts and currents of Occidental literature and civilization. He was a Slavophil only in the sense that he wished to avert the bastardization of Russian culture with certain completely incompatible and unworthy standards of the West. Therefore he exaggerated and overemphasized the dangers of British utilitarianism, of German "Kultur-Propaganda," and of the generally West-European "pseudo-liberalism"—of the *idées-forces* of 1789 and 1848. Although clinging to a number of Russia's sanctities, Dostoyevski recognized the worth of many a foundation of the European spirit and philosophy, eagerly imbued himself with a great deal of Western ideologies, and his intellectual stature is quite inconceivable without that absorption in the noble components of the Occident.

The foregoing considerations corroborate the thesis of the one-

ness, solidarity, and homogeneity, the continent-wide common denominator of a Pan-European culture, at least until the advent of Bolshevism. Dostoyevski's intimate participation in the Occidental patrimony, despite his proud nationalism, evinces the impossibility of dissecting a civilization into provincially antagonistic compartments, and of lowering a hostile and impermeable non curtain of historical self-righteousness in the indivisible realm of the human spirit

MARCEL I. WEINREICH

Deep Springs College
California

A NOTE ON THE NATURAL BRIDGE IN *ATALA*

Chateaubriand, quite in harmony with his idea of unfolding "une nature et des mœurs tout-à-fait étrangères à l'Europe,"¹ provided for Atala, after her death, not the usual grave in a Christian cemetery or church, but a tomb in the cathedral of Nature. She found her last resting place under the majestic arches of a Natural Bridge. Was this *pont naturel* one of the poet's extraordinary inventions, a superimposed fiction on an imaginary American landscape? Can we rely, here, on Chateaubriand when he asserts. "J'ose dire que la nature américaine y est peinte avec la plus scrupuleuse exactitude."²

Most critics believe in a fanciful transfer of the *Natural Bridge* to Tennessee. According to A. Le Braz³ the bridge, and the tomb of Atala under it, were in St. Margaret's in Suffolk County, England. "C'est sous la voûte de cette arche (of the rustic bridge leading to the parsonage of the Reverend John Ives) qu'il (Chateaubriand) fait creuser à Chactas la sépulture d'Atala. . . Il ne faut donc pas chercher sur l'autre rive de l'Atlantique la tombe de la "fille du désert" elle doit reposer en un coin de cimetière anglais. . ." A similar view is held by Auguste Dupont in his edition of *Atala*.⁴ Caroline Stewart goes one step farther in her discussion

¹ Gilbert Chinard, *Chateaubriand, Atala, Rene*, Paris, Roches, 1930, préface, 7.

² *Ibid.*, préface, 23.

³ *Au pays d'exil de Chateaubriand*, Paris, Champion, 1909, 180 ff.

⁴ Paris, Larousse, n. d.

of *The Natural Bridge* She believed that Chateaubriand drew here a composite picture of the Mission at Saint-François, then added to it scenes from the neighborhood of Bungay, and finally from descriptions of Malesherbes' estate "It requires no stretch of imagination to suppose that Chateaubriand visited (the estate of Malesherbes) and that he transferred some of the local color . . . to 'Atala' " ⁵

At first glance, G. Chinard's explanation of the *Natural Bridge* appears to us very plausible According to him, the poet eased his task by presenting a word painting of the etchings by Chastellux This artistic traveler and French Major General had attached pictures of the already famous Virginia Bridge to his *Voyages* of 1787. "Trois gravures y sont annexées elles pourraient servir d'illustrations dans une édition d'*Atala*. - Une fois de plus Chateaubriand semble donc s'être inspiré d'une gravure accompagnant un récit de voyage " ⁶ Chinard points out that the poet describes the woods and the clear brook as well as the symmetrical groups of pine trees and the steep ascents which shut in the valley of the Virginia Bridge on both sides The whole scene can be found on the historical print by Chastellux But the dale at the Bridge in Virginia is so narrow that there would hardly be room behind the arch for *les Bocages de la mort*, or for the extensive cemetery for the Christian Indians from good père Aubry's flock, nor could, on account of the sharp incline of the ground under the bridge, the *Ruisseau de la paix* flow so peacefully as its name indicates. Does Chateaubriand's bridge evoke the idea of the regularity and neatness of the Roman arch of the Virginia wonder? Could anybody imagine that the Natural Bridge of Virginia with its enormous height of 215 feet would be endangered by any flood? Where, in Chastellux's picture, is a lake, where is a cavern for a hermit? Why, after all, should Chateaubriand conceive the idea of bringing the well-known Bridge of Virginia down to Tennessee? He would have exposed himself as a liar, a reproach he tried anxiously to avoid. Moreover, Chateaubriand's rather wide valley is bounded on the east by the Natural Bridge, gentle hillsides border it on the

⁵ Caroline Stewart, *Atala and René*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1926, 161

⁶ Chinard, *L'Exotisme Américain dans l'Œuvre de Chateaubriand*, Paris, Hachette, 1918, 264

south and north, in the west it is open, but there is a somber forest of fir trees

Of special interest for Chateaubriand, was the Tennessee River or the "Cherokee," as it was called because the Cherokee Indians inhabited its banks. He noticed where this unusual river starts, how it flows west and finally turns north to join the Ohio.⁷ Here the poet lets his lovers Atala and Chactas float down toward the setting sun. "Le fleuve couloit entre de hautes falaises, au bout desquelles on apercevoit le soleil couchant. Nous ne vîmes qu'un chasseur indien qui, appuyé sur son arc et immobile sur la pointe d'un rocher, ressembloit à une statue élevée dans la montagne au génie de ces déserts"⁸ Down with the current of the river the innocent pair went, but, after two weeks in their small boat, they had to go ashore to save their lives. In the darkness during a terrible storm, and after several hours' wandering, the shipwrecked were rescued and brought to a large cave in mountainous territory, where was a Natural Bridge, similar to the one in Virginia.

On another landmark of the Old South, the Natchez Trace, Chateaubriand maintained to have traveled himself. "Une compagnie de trafiquants, venant de chez les Creeks, dans les Florides, me permit de la suivre. Nous suivions à peu près des *sentiers* que lie maintenant la grande route des Natchez à Nashville par Jackson et Florence, et qui rentre en Virginie par Knoxville et Salem"⁹ It is noteworthy that the poet translated the unusual designation of the road from Natchez to Nashville with the correct term *sentier*, while from there onward the route was known as the "Wilderness Road." Chateaubriand meant, without doubt, this ancient Indian Trace, which passed the village of the Mission near the Natural Bridge not far from the Tennessee River. "On y arrivoit par une avenue de magnolias et de chênes-verts, qui bordoient une de ces anciennes routes, que l'on trouve vers les montagnes qui divisent le Kentucky des Florides."¹⁰

⁷ Après quinze nuits d'une marche précipitée, nous entrâmes dans la chaîne des monts Allégany, et nous atteignîmes une des branches du Tenase, fleuve qui se jette dans l'Ohio. Chinard, *Atala et René*, 69.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 70. This passage is taken from W. Bartram, *Travels through North & South Carolina, Georgia, East & West Florida*, 1791, Philadelphia, 1791, 347.

⁹ *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 402 (Biré, Nouvelle Edition).

¹⁰ Gilbert Chinard, *Chateaubriand, Atala René*, Editions Fernand Roches, Paris, 87.

On the Natchez Trace, a few miles after its intersection with the Tennessee River, in the hilly territory northward, we find Chateaubriand's Natural Bridge. It is not so imposing and not so well known as its namesake in Virginia. Chateaubriand's description of the bridge tallies with every detail. Here we find the enormous cave of père Aubry, where the lovers found shelter, and where Atala died. In the large domelike cavity under the bridge the Red Warriors from far and wide gathered and held their councils.¹¹ Many of the Indians probably were converted here to Christianity by some pious hermit and buried outside in the Indian cemetery. Behind the Natural Bridge is the smooth mirror of a lake from which comes a meandering brook. On the north and south of this "asile riant" are slight elevations and in the west the view is closed by a somber forest. One can easily pluck here magnolia blossoms to adorn the hair of the beloved one. Here are in abundance the locust trees (acacias) and the laurels where red birds (cardinaux) and mocking-birds love to nest. And—mirabile dictu—Chateaubriand's observation was correct for this region. "Quelques renards dispersés par l'orage allongeoient leurs museaux noirs au bord des précipices."¹² Here in this section there are the habitats of foxes and annual fox hunting is a tradition.

How easily may Chateaubriand have imagined that the bridge could be destroyed by floods from the lake. Every spring the otherwise quiet water inundates the whole region and, seemingly, endangers this wonder of nature. Marks of the high floods can be seen everywhere on the rocks of the bridge and on the cliffs of the hillsides. In the middle of the long arch of the bridge is a gaping hole caused by the corrosion of time. So it was quite natural for Chateaubriand to surmise that the burial place of Atala could be covered up by the débris from the bridge and disappear. When Chactas arrives after several years to find the grave of his beloved one, this calamity has happened. "Le lac s'étoit débordé, et la savane étoit changée en un marais, le pont naturel, en s'écroulant, avoit enseveli sous ses débris le tombeau d'Atala et les Bocages de la mort."¹³ In the Natural Bridge near Waynesboro, Tennessee, we have thus the actual description of an American scene by one of

¹¹ Historical markers indicate it.

¹² Gilbert Chinard, *ibid.*, 83.

¹³ Gilbert Chinard, *ibid.*, 126.

the most prominent French writers. As far as this wonder of nature is concerned, we must admit that Chateaubriand gave a graphic account of it "avec la plus scrupuleuse exactitude"

JOHN C. FRANK

American University

MARCEL PROUST'S MAXIMS AGAIN

In editing recently a collection of *The Maxims of Marcel Proust*¹ drawn from the sixteen volumes of *A la recherche du temps perdu*, I failed to invoke every justification for such a bold understaking. To be sure, the Introduction quotes in English the capital passage from *Le Temps retrouvé*

Quant aux vérités que l'intelligence—même des plus hauts esprits—cueille à clameur, devant elle, en pleine lumière, leur valeur peut être très grande, mais elles ont des contours plus secs et sont planes, n'ont pas de profondeur parce qu'il n'y a pas eu de profondeurs à franchir pour les attendre, parce qu'elles n'ont pas été recréées.

Je sentais pourtant que ces vérités que l'intelligence dégage directement de la réalité ne sont pas à dédaigner entièrement car elles pourraient en chasser d'une matière moins pure mais encore pénétrer d'esprit ces impressions que nous apportent hors du temps l'essence commune aux sensations du passé et du présent, mais qui plus précieuses sont aussi trop rares pour que l'œuvre d'art puisse être composée seulement avec elles. Capables d'être utilisées pour cela, je sentais se presser en moi une foule de vérités relatives aux passions, aux caractères, aux mœurs.²

But following this quotation there should have been a reference to the very significant letter that Proust wrote to Mme Sheikévitch in late 1915 on the blank pages of her copy of *Du côté de chez Swann*.³ That distinguished lady having asked the author what became of Mme Swann as she grew older, Proust proceeded to summarize for her all the rest of his work as it then stood in the proofs later to be examined by Professor Albert Feuillerat.

¹ Columbia University Press, 1948.

² Paris, Gallimard, 1927, II 52-53.

³ Most accessible in *Correspondance générale de Marcel Proust*, Plon, Paris, 1935, v 234-241, but first printed in *Lettres à Madame Sheikévitch*, Paris, Librairie des Champs-Élysées, 1928, 57-66, where it is also reproduced in facsimile.

In that summary, which fills but seven printed pages, it is noteworthy that Proust sets down no fewer than six aphorisms, all of which reappear almost textually in later volumes of *A la recherche du temps perdu*. The first one is worded thus in the letter

Puis, quand je la soupçonne sur des riens, et pour des riens aussi lui rends ma confiance, "car c'est le propre de l'amour de nous rendre à la fois plus défiant et plus crédule" ⁴

The second and third of the aphorisms in the letter occur in juxtaposition, as follows

En voyant combien je m'étais trompé, je compris combien la souffrance va plus loin en psychologie que le meilleur psychologue, et que la connaissance des éléments composants de notre âme nous est donnée non par les plus fines perceptions de notre intelligence mais—dure, éclatante, étrange comme un sel soudain cristallisé—par la brusque réaction de la douleur

In the novel they are separated by only a page but, whereas the first has gained through the repetition of the word *psychologie*, the second has lost some of its sharpness

"Mademoiselle Albertine est partie!" Comme la souffrance va plus loin en psychologie que la psychologie! ⁵

Mais notre intelligence, si grande soit-elle, ne peut apercevoir les éléments qui le composent et qui restent insoupçonnées tant que, de l'état volatil où ils subsistent la plupart du temps, un phénomène capable de les isoler ne leur a pas fait subir un commencement de solidification ⁶

The fourth example from the letter has undergone but little change upon entering the novel

Pour entrer en nous, un être est obligé de prendre la forme, de se plier au cadre du temps, ne nous apparaissant que par minutes successives, il n'a jamais pu nous livrer de lui qu'un seul aspect à la fois, nous débiter de lui qu'une seule photographie. Grande faiblesse sans doute pour un être de ne consister qu'en une collection de moments, grande force aussi, car il relève de la mémoire, et la mémoire d'un certain moment n'est pas instruite

⁴ The quotation marks are in the original, but the maxim has been refined before it finds its way into the novel. "Les exigences de notre jalousie et l'aveuglement de notre crédulité sont plus grands que ne pouvait supposer la femme que nous aimons" *La Prisonnière*, Paris, Gallimard, 1923, I 129

⁵ *Albertine disparue*, Paris, Gallimard, 1925, I 7

⁶ *Ibid.*, I 8. This aphorism was eliminated from *The Maxims of Marcel Proust*

de ce qui s'est passé depuis, ce moment qu'elle a enregistré dure encore et avec lui vit l'être qui s'y profilait ⁷

The fifth aphorism appears thus in the letter

Et ainsi, ce qui nous rappelle le mieux un être, c'est justement ce que nous avons oublié parce que c'était sans importance ⁸

The sixth and final maxim occurs in the last lines of the letter

Au bout de quelque temps, un malade atteint de cancer sera mort. Il est bien rare qu'un veuf inconsolable, au bout du même temps, ne soit pas guéri ⁹

Surely it is significant that in a rapid summary of the contents of several volumes, written for a friend who had simply asked what eventually became of Mme Swann, Proust should have included as many as six aphorisms to occur in those volumes. Strictly limited by the space offered by the blanks preceding the title-page (as one can see in the facsimile where his writing becomes progressively smaller as he nears the end of his letter), Marcel Proust nevertheless felt such general truths to be essential in reproducing the flavor and content of his work in progress. Nothing could indicate more compellingly the value he set upon such conscious truths, the fruit of an observant and reflective life.

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

Columbia University

⁷ In *Albertine disparue*, I 100, the first verb is put into the past (*un être a été obligé*) and the last clause reads *ce moment qu'elle a enregistré dure encore, vit encore et avec lui l'être qui s'y profilait*

⁸ In the novel this thought has been inserted into the middle of a sentence: "Or, les souvenirs d'amour ne font pas exception aux lois générales de la mémoire elles-mêmes régies par les lois plus générales de l'habitude. Comme celle-ci affaiblit tout, ce qui nous rappelle le mieux un être, c'est justement ce que nous avons oublié (parce que c'était insignifiant et que nous lui avons laissé ainsi toute sa force)." *A l'ombre des jeunes filles en fleurs*, Paris, Gallimard, 1919, II 60

⁹ In *Albertine disparue*, II 140, the thought has been expressed in a single sentence and the "inconsolable widower" has been generalized: "Au bout du même temps où un malade atteint du cancer sera mort, il est bien rare qu'un veuf, un père inconsolables ne soient pas guéris."

THE EARLIEST ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF
LA ROCHEFOUCAULD'S *MAXIMES*

The *Short Title Catalogue*'s linking of La Rochefoucauld's name with the very rare volume, *Epictetus Junior, or Maximes of Modern Morality*,¹ a translation by John Davies of Kidwelly, is, I believe, the first indication in print that the two are related. A comparison of the two texts shows that Davies' work is really a hitherto unnoticed close translation (with certain minor additions) of the *Maximes*. The relationship has probably escaped detection because Davies worked, not from one of the standard editions of La Rochefoucauld, but rather from the *édition préoriginale* published at The Hague in 1664—an edition which contains only certain of the *Maximes*, and these arranged in radically different order. This 1664 edition (which, incidentally, has become almost as rare as the *Epictetus Junior*,)² was disowned by La Rochefoucauld as a pirated text, a "méchante copie," but certain of his editors have unkindly supposed that it really had his secret blessing as a sort of "trial balloon" for the first Paris edition which was to appear in 1665.

Davies did not, indeed, try to conceal his indebtedness to a French source. If he had attempted such a ruse, it would undoubtedly have called forth comment, for by 1670 he already had a well-established reputation as a translator from the French, with over a dozen translations—some of them highly popular—to his credit. The Epistle Dedicatory to the *Epictetus Junior* states

¹ *Epictetus Junior, / or / Maximes / of / Modern Morality / In / Two Centuries / Collected / by J D of Kidwelly / London, / Printed for T Basset, . / / 1670 / Pp [viii] + 137. The Epistle Dedicatory is signed "J Davies"*

² Mr Donald Wing has kindly directed me to the Bodleian Library for the only known copy of the *Epictetus Junior*. The existence of the 1664 The Hague edition of La Rochefoucauld was long doubted (even by La Rochefoucauld's editor in the *Grands Ecrits* series). A single copy was rediscovered in the late nineteenth century, and the known copies have now risen to seven (cf. Jean Marchand, "L'Edition de 1664 des *Maximes* de la Rochefoucauld et sa réimpression ignorée (La Haye, 1743, pet in —12°)," *Bulletin du Bibliophile et du Bibliothécaire*, Octobre, 1947, p. 455). The 1664 text is available, however, in the facsimile edition, Paris, 1883, edited by Alphonse Pauly.

As to the present Collection of *Maximes*, I am to acknowledge, that the greatest part of it was made by a person of eminent Quality in France The several Editions of it there, and in the Low Countries, sufficiently argue its kind reception among the Ingenious, in these parts

And so, while he may not have known La Rochefoucauld as the author, it is clear from the above comments that Davies was aware of the relationship of the Hague and the Paris editions of the *Maximes*, the early editions of which, it should be noted, appeared without the name of the author

Proof that Davies used the 1664 text is relatively easy to muster The most obvious point is that Davies' version ³ is a close rendering (with a very few interspersions) which follows the exact order of the 1664 text (and it will be remembered that this latter differs radically in this respect from the 1665 and subsequent texts) Then, too, the significant printing errors in the 1664 edition, as listed by Monsieur Pauly,⁴ are all detectable in the Davies rendering One final detail is a sure give-away, if any further evidence is necessary On page 26 of the English translation the printer has put in the margin an unexplained note "P 19" In confronting the translation with the original, one discovers that this particular maxim is found on page 19 in the Hague text One must suppose that a note in the manuscript, doubtless intended only for the translator's reference, has somehow crept into the printed text

I have been unable to locate any reprintings or later editions of the *Epictetus Junior*, but have found it advertised as late as 1687 by the bookseller Thomas Fabian, in his catalogue appearing at the end of La Calprenède's *Hymen's Præcludra* . . . , London, 1687 The later seventeenth-century translators of La Rochefoucauld—Mrs Behn who Englished the *Maximes* under the title "Seneca Unmasked, or, Moral Reflections,"⁵ and the anonymous author of the

³ Davies' "two centuries" really contain one additional maxim, since he has used the number 190 twice In these 201 are included all of the 188 maxims of the original Two of the original 188 (xxvi and clxxiv) have been divided, and become four in the translation Hence, 190 of Davies' maxims are direct translations from the French Eleven others (Numbers xxx, cxv, cxxxvii, cxxxviii, clxiv, clxxix, cxovi—cc) are original with Davies In these last, we may discover an occasional contemporary reference, but in general they are in imitation of La Rochefoucauld himself, and as such are not particularly successful, nor worthy of special note

⁴ In his facsimile edition, p xv, footnote

⁵ Included as pp. 301-382 in her *Miscellany* . . . , London, 1685

1694 translation⁶—appear to have worked directly from the authorized French text, and without consulting Davies' version

JOSEPH E. TUCKER

University of Wisconsin

OTHELLO AND PEREGRINA, "RICHER THAN ALL HIS TRIBE"

In the last act of Shakespeare's play *Othello*, the Moor remarks on the results of his jealous actions, the ugly murder—or, to be more exact, the burking—of Desdemona, in language highly figurative, for he compares himself with one

whose hand
(Like the base Indian)¹ threw a pearl away
Richer than all his Tribe (v, ii, 346-348)²

The phrase "his Tribe" refers, not to the "Indian," but to the "pearl." That is, the Indian was not richer than other members of his tribe, instead the "pearl," like the unparalleled Desdemona which the jewel symbolizes, was richer than all other gems. Moreover, the pearl in Shakespeare was not a feminine but a neuter noun, in point of fact, the word is also neuter in Middle English, as is seen in Sir John Mandeville's similar phrasing in a reference in his *Travels* to "right as the perl, of his owne kynde"³. Finally, in both Mandeville and Shakespeare *his* is equivalent to *its* since in Old as well as Middle English *his* was the standard genitive form for the masculine and neuter genders⁴.

The purpose of the passage in Shakespeare, it is clear, is to enlarge on the unique richness of the pearl. All attempts to place

⁶ *Moral Maxims and Reflections* Written in French, by the Duke of Rochefoucault, London, 1694. There was a second edition in 1706.

¹ Judean in the First Folio but corrected to Indian in the others.

² G. L. Kittredge (ed.), *Sixteen Plays of Shakespeare* (New York, 1946), p. 1260.

³ Kenneth Sisam (ed.), *Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose* (Oxford, 1928), p. 98.

⁴ Samuel Moore and Thomas A. Knott, *The Elements of Old English* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1942), p. 32; O. F. Emerson, *A Middle English Reader* (London, 1929), p. xcvi.

the focus of interest upon the Indian as an exceptional member of his own savage band are therefore based upon a misconception of the meaning of Shakespeare's words.⁵ The possibility, apparently not hitherto considered, that the dramatist may have had in mind an actual historical jewel so exceptional that it outranked all its kindred thus appears altogether worthy of investigation. An Elizabethan audience, in other words, would understand that Shakespeare was depicting a jewel richer than all its tribe and might naturally associate the allusion with a contemporary jewel if this gem were sufficiently unique in value to be so described.

In this connection, surely the most famous pearl in Shakespeare's day was the rare jewel known to the art of the lapidary as Peregrina.⁶ This gem was a perfect stone of thirty-one carats in the shape of a pear. At an auction in August, 1515, Peregrina was sold for twelve hundred pieces of gold, and at subsequent sales its value continued to increase. Even at that early date the stone achieved no inconsiderable fame: it was depicted in three celebrated paintings as the main adornment of Mary Tudor's lavish costume,⁷ it featured prominently in laudatory descriptions in the writings of both Lope de Vega and the great Cervantes.⁸ That the jewel would be well known to contemporary Englishmen is established by the fact that it figured as a gift to Mary Tudor from her husband Philip II of Spain upon the auspicious occasion of their wedding in 1554.⁹ The significant occurrence of a royal marriage involving the two powerful houses of England and Spain would call prominent attention to Peregrina at a date well in advance of Shakespeare's composition of *Othello* in 1604,¹⁰ therefore a seventeenth-

⁵ The notes in the Variorum Edition by Furness (pp. 327-331, note 421) have largely to do with vain attempts to identify the "Iudean." The statement of Professor Kittredge (*op cit*, p. 1311) that the "supposed ignorance of savages with regard to the value of precious stones had become proverbial" has obvious value.

⁶ Octavio Mendez Pereira, *Balboa* (ed. Everett W. Hesse, New York, 1944), pp. 149-150.

⁷ As for the three paintings, one is in the Museum of Prado, Madrid, Spain, another in Hampton Court, Middlesex, England (whose galleries are open to the public), and yet another in Winchester Cathedral, where the marriage of Mary Tudor and Philip II occurred.

⁸ See O. M. Pereira, *op cit*, p. 150.

⁹ "Mary I," *DNB*, Vol. XII (London, 1921-22), p. 1230.

¹⁰ Kittredge accepts 1604 as the date of composition (*op cit*, p. 1215),

century playgoer upon hearing a pearl described as "Richer than all his Tribe" would most likely call to mind the oft-discussed history of the well-known Peregrina

Literary allusions to Peregrina were of course current in contemporary Spanish writings, as already noted in the works of Lope de Vega and Cervantes. Now, as for Shakespeare's own reference to the pearl and "the base Indian," it is instructive that in order to purchase peace from the Spaniards, an Indian chief of the Island of Pearls, on the American Pacific coast, gave Balboa Peregrina—this incident marking its first appearance in recorded history. The Spaniards did not honor the pledge, soon making war anew against the lowly and base aborigines,¹¹ thus, in effect, the Indian leader figuratively threw away Peregrina. In conclusion, there would be unquestionable appropriateness in Shakespeare's associating the exotic experiences of the Moor Othello as a distant traveller, which are emphasized throughout the play, with the frequently repeated stories about Peregrina, which Spanish word means a pilgrim or a peregrinator.

VIOLA HADLOCK ANDERSON

Texas College of Mines

THE EARTHQUAKE IN *ROMEO AND JULIET*

One of the best known of the presumed topical references in Shakespeare is the Nurse's statement in *Romeo and Juliet*, "'Tis since the earthquake now eleven years"¹. Those who assume that Shakespeare intended a reference to an actual earthquake have almost universally applied the Nurse's remark to the famous English earthquake of 1580, and they have therefore concluded that *Romeo and Juliet* was written in 1591.² Other scholars, while

as also do R. M. Alden and O. J. Campbell, *A Shakespeare Handbook* (New York, 1932), p. 66, and Furness (ed.) *Othello*, p. 357

¹¹ O. M. Pereira, *op. cit.*, p. 150

¹ I, III, 23

² See, for example, T. W. Baldwin, *Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, 1947), 772-3. Prof. Baldwin instances, in support of his statement that "there could be no question as to what 'the Earthquake' would signify to the audience," the publication of Arthur Golding's *A discourse*

accepting the probability that a reference to an earthquake would suggest that of 1580 to an Elizabethan audience, have nevertheless argued cogently against placing too literal an interpretation on the Nurse's chronology.³ It is possible to go even further, however, and to argue that a reference in the 1590's to an earthquake would not necessarily suggest that of 1580. In a work published in 1595, William Covell's *Polimanteia*, England is represented as making the following remarks "to all her Inhabitants"

And as for my owne part (sillie distressed as I am) I have considered the threatnings of God against my subiects liues the tokens sent me not long since the wonders that heaven shewed the lowde speech that the dumbe creatures used, and all onely for this end, that I fearing might perswade you, and you perswaded might make mee to liue without feare yet I relie not so farre upon Astrological] reason, as vpon the strange starre 1572 the Comets that haue appeared since the great thunder 1584 the terrible Earth quake the first of March the same yeare the strange inundations not long since the fearefull mortallitie that hath hewed downe my tallest Cedars, and moued (as it were) the lesser plants yet I take these to bee meanes to humble me, least in pride of courage I ouerweiningly doe loue my selfe.⁴

What is significant in this passage is not merely the reference to a terrible earthquake on March 1, 1584, it is also the context of that reference. Covell, in the person of England, is recalling the most awesome natural prodigies of the past twenty years, and it is the 1584 earthquake rather than that of 1580, which finds its place in the list. To at least one literate and well-educated Englishman of the period, therefore, Shakespeare's earthquake reference would not automatically have suggested 1580.

That the 1584 earthquake has so far escaped the attention of scholars can be explained by the fact that it aroused almost no contemporary literary attention, perhaps because the subject had been worked to exhaustion in connection with the 1580 earthquake. We cannot even be sure that the 1584 earthquake was felt in England at all, the only contemporary reference to it, outside of Covell, localizes it in Geneva.⁵ But that it made a great impression

vpon the earthquake in 1589. But the S T C entry (11987) upon which Baldwin depends is in error here, the Golding book was published in 1580 (see the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books)

³ E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, I, 345

⁴ Sig Y2r-v

⁵ On June 23, 1584, a work was licensed to T. Woodcock entitled *A true*

in England can hardly be doubted, if we accept Covell as a reliable witness.

Scholars are almost unanimous in dating *Romeo and Juliet* in 1595, on stylistic grounds, and if we now assume that Shakespeare had a 1584 earthquake in mind, the only major obstacle to dating the play in 1595 disappears. It is even possible to speculate that a reading of Covell's book may have suggested the earthquake reference to Shakespeare. *Polimantera*, we may remember, is famous for its praise of "Lucrecia Sweet Shakspeare", and it would be natural for a young author to want to read a work which, for almost the first time in print, praised him by name.

SIDNEY THOMAS

Queens College

DAME MARY ETHEREGE

The information concerning the wife and marriage of Sir George Etherege, the poet, has to date been confined to three sources: the gossip recorded in three contemporary satires, a mention of some money dealings in which Etherege's wife was involved before their marriage, and Etherege's own desultory mention of his wife in his correspondence from Ratisbon.¹

discourse happened by an earthquake primo martij 1584 / in the places adioynnge to the lake of Geneva (Arber, *S R*, II 433). In two works published in 1595, Anthoine Fletcher's *Certaine Very Proper and Most Profitable Similes* (Sig. X2^r), and Bartholomew Chappell's *The Garden of Prudence* (Sig. B7^r), there are references to an earthquake which occurred "of late." No definite year is named in either work, and it is impossible to tell which earthquake is meant.

¹ The satires are as follows:

"The Present State of Matrimony," BM, Harleian MS 7319, ff. 152-155.

"To Julian: A Consolatory Epistle," BM, Harleian MS 7317, ff. 37-38.

"An Answer to the Satyr on the Court Ladies," BM, Harleian MS 7319, ff. 48-50.

The financial complications which resulted from the fact that Etherege's wife had made a mortgage loan on some Westminster lands are recorded in a Chancery trial fully investigated by Dorothy Foster, "Sir George Etherege: Collections," *Notes and Queries*, CLIII (Dec. 24, 1927), 456-459.

For Etherege's references to his wife in his correspondence, see *The Letterbook of Sir George Etherege*, ed. Sybil Rosenfeld (Oxford, 1928), pp. 161-2, 293, 328, 338, and Sybil Rosenfeld, "Sir George Etherege in Ratisbon," *RES*, x (April, 1934), 188.

Some further knowledge of Lady Etherege can be gained however, from a bit of information, not previously used, in a letter from Sir Leoline Jenkins to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford.² This letter identifies Etherege's wife as the widow of Edmund Arnold, and further investigation reveals that her maiden name was Mary Sheppard, that she was the daughter and coheirress of John Sheppard of London and that she married Arnold before 1648.³

Edmund Arnold was the second child of Edward Arnold and was baptized at the parish of Stowe, Northamptonshire, on June 7, 1607. He attended school nearby and began his clerkship at St. Giles, not far from his birthplace. Some time later (we do not know the exact date), he purchased, "with the fruits of his professional industry," the manor of Furtho in Clely Hundred, Northamptonshire.⁴

The next date we have in Arnold's life is August, 1648, when his son, Edmund, was baptized at St. Bene't, Paul's Wharf, in London. In 1651, a second son, John, born to "Edmund Arnall and Mary his w.," was baptized at the same parish. Both sons were dead, however, by 1673, three years before the death of their father.⁵

The earliest record of Arnold in law circles is in 1661 when he received the Bachelor of Law degree at Oxford. At this time he belonged to the Court of Arches, an ecclesiastical court of Doctor's Commons in London, and was spoken of as being "of Merton College."⁶ However it is probable that he was at Doctor's Commons as early as 1648, since his first child was baptized at the parish of St. Bene't, Paul's Wharf, which was also the location of the Doctor's Commons buildings and living quarters.

References to Arnold after 1661 become more numerous and he seems to have had a rather active law career. In 1662 or 1663 he

² *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Oct. 1683-April 1684*, p. 219.

³ *London Visitation Pedigrees, 1664* (Harleian Society Publications), xcii, 8.

⁴ George Baker, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Northampton* (London, 1836-41), II, 157-59.

⁵ *Parish Records of St. Bene't, Paul's Wharf* (HSP, Registers), xxxviii, 25, 27, and *Obituary of Richard Smith* (Camden Society Publications), xlv, 99. The elder son, Edmund, matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1666. See Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1891), early series I, 31.

⁶ Anthony à Wood, *Fasti Oxoniensis*, ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1820), II, 252.

was in a position to help secure a chamber in Doctor's Commons for Dr Thomas Jones of Oxford, and at that time was referred to as "a civilian and college tenant" in London.⁷ Three years later he was appointed proctor to signify to the King the election of a new bishop at Bangor and to request royal confirmation.⁸ In 1669, in a marriage allegation, he was listed as being of Exeter House, Strand, which was the temporary location of the offices of Doctor's Commons after the Great Fire, and we find him still listed as a proctor in the Court of Arches in 1674 and 1676.⁹ He was also, at some time during his career, register of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, another of the five courts which made up Doctor's Commons.¹⁰ On the first of May, 1675, Arnold made out his will, and a codicil was signed March 22, 1676. Arnold died March 27, 1676, and was buried at his Furtho estate.

In his will Arnold left certain legacies to his brothers' and sisters' children, including forty shillings to a Thomas Arnold. The yearly income from the manor at Furtho, however, he left to his wife, Mary, to be given, after her death, to various charities which he enumerated in detail. These gifts came to be known as Arnold's Charity. He devised the advowson (parish patronage) of Furtho to the principal, fellows, and scholars of Jesus College, Oxford, and the residue of his personal estate, 1500 pounds, to be distributed among his kinsmen according to their needs. The trustees for the charity were selected by Arnold from among his friends and associates. One of them, Sir Leoline Jenkins, Knt, L.L.D., judge of the Admiralty and Prerogative Courts, was later, as we have seen, from his position as Secretary at Whitehall, again to be concerned with Arnold's widow in connection with the advowson. This was after she had become Lady Etherege.¹¹

⁷ *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford, 1891), I, 395.

⁸ *CSPD, 1665-1666*, p. 189.

⁹ *Marriage Licenses—Vicar General—1669-1679* (HSP), xxxiv, 10, 130, and Edward Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia*, 8th edition, 1674, part II, 270, and 9th edition, 1676, part II, 241.

¹⁰ *London Visitation Pedigrees*, loc. cit.

¹¹ Arnold's will itself has not been examined, so whether Mary Arnold received more than the Furtho estate itself cannot be stated. The information here given was collected from Baker's *History of the County of Northampton*, loc. cit. and from the records of the two claims to the estate appearing in the House of Lords Journals. The first, begun in 1678 in

Two or three years after the death of Edmund Arnold, Mary Arnold was married to Etherege. The exact date of this marriage has not been discovered. Lady Etherege is said to have died shortly after her husband in January 1691-92.¹² No record of her death was examined, but the January date is lent credence by Col Chester's report that he found the record of administration to the estate of a Dame Mary Etherege, widow, dated February 1, 1692.¹³

These facts about Etherege's wife fit in well with the satirist's contention that Etherege married "a rich old widow." Mary Arnold had been her father's heir, and was receiving, in addition to any outright gift that her husband may have left her, 240 pounds yearly from his estate. Considering her first marriage to have taken place before 1648, she would have been at least forty-five or fifty at the time of her marriage to Etherege who himself was not over forty-four. The reasons behind such a match as this, and the possible channels or contacts through which Etherege could have met his wife are considerations which make possible several conjectures on the character of Etherege and on one of the vague periods in this author's biography.

JOHN W. NICHOL

Ohio State University

Chancery, rejected, appealed, and finally rejected by the House of Lords in 1690, was by William Jeneway and his wife, grandchildren of Arnold's father's sister. They claimed a portion of the 1500 pounds as "needy kinsmen." The phrase was interpreted, however, as applying only to the brothers and sisters of the testator and their children. (Historical Manuscripts Commission, *11th Report, Appendix, Part II*, 215-16 and *MSS of the House of Lords*, III, 154.)

The second claim filed in Chancery in 1693, rejected, appealed, and finally rejected by the House of Lords in 1698, was by Thomas Arnold to whom Arnold had left forty shillings in his will. He proved that the amounts specified for the charities in the will totaled only 120 pounds, whereas the income from the manor was 240 pounds, and laid claim, as legal heir, to the surplus. It was decided, however, that charity was the main intent of the will, and that the surplus should be apportioned among the specified donations. (HMC, *MSS of the House of Lords*, n s III, 201-202.)

¹² Baker, *County of Northampton, loc cit*

¹³ Edmund Gosse, *Seventeenth Century Studies* (New York, 1914), pp 297-98

THE UNIVERSITY MISCELLANIES SOME NEGLECTED
EARLY TEXTS OF CLEVELAND AND COWLEY

Between 1637 and 1660 Cleveland published two and Cowley five poems in the university miscellanies. Though none of these poems fails to appear in the standard modern editions of their works, one of Cleveland's and two of Cowley's have been reprinted only from later editions.¹

Berdan knew that Cleveland's "Returned, I'll ne'er believe 't, . . ." first appeared in the *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis Ob paciferum Serenissimi Regis Caroli à Scotia reditum Mense Novembri 1641*

(Cambridge, 1641), sigs L1^v-L2^r, but he was unable to see the volume and so reprinted the poem from the 1677 edition of the works (reprinted twice, perhaps thrice, the same year), collated with the *J. Cleaveland Revived*, 1659 (reprinted 1660, 1662, 1668).² Though the miscellany version differs mostly in minor matters of spelling and punctuation which do not affect the meaning of the poem, and only slightly in wording, and though some word differences, such as "counterpane" (l 42) for "counterpart" are apparently misprints, some of the earlier readings are better than, or at least as good as, the later.³

Cowley's "Welcome, Great Sir, . . ." was edited by Waller from

¹ Professor Francis L. Utley (*MLQ*, III, 1942, 244, n. 5) noticed the early text of Cleveland's poem and one of Cowley's, but had no opportunity to reprint them or to describe the variants. He also noticed that Joseph Beaumont's "Lemniscus redeunt cum . . .," which occurs in the same miscellany, is not included in Eloise Robinson's edition of Beaumont's minor poems (Boston, 1914), but he did not mention that this poem occurs in Grosart's edition of Beaumont's poetical works (2 vols., Chertsey Worthies Library, 1877-1880), with the miscellany correctly indicated as its source. Jean Loiseau, in his biography of Cowley, lists both the Cowley poems and their miscellany sources, but likewise neglects to reprint them or to notice the variants (*Abraham Cowley, sa vie, son œuvre*, Paris, 1931, p. 657).

² John M. Berdan, *The Poems of John Cleveland* (New Haven, 1911), pp. 29, 127-128, 222, 253, and Errata.

³ l 1 REturn'd?	l 28 javeling we
l 7 their knot	l 29 soul had taken wing, while we ^e expresse
l 21 spider's, spun	l 30 our principles
l 26 made the gun recoyl.	l 33 the wrong,

the folio of 1668, collated with the folio of 1656,⁴ without mention that the poem also appears in the *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis* . . . (sig K1^{rdv}) This version of the poem differs from Waller's not only in spelling and punctuation but in title, order of stanzas, and frequent words and phrases—all of which substantially change the meaning. Such later alterations as the new title and "Scots" for "Sons" (131) are logical improvements or corrections of apparent error, but, as in Cleveland's poem, some of the earlier variants make as good or better reading than the later.⁵

"Christ's Passion," translated by Cowley from a Greek ode by Thomas Masteis (1633), was reprinted by Waller from the folio of 1668 collated with the *Verses on Several Occasions*, 1663.⁶ It had already appeared, however, in *D. Henrici Savili . . . Oratio, coram Regina Elizabetha Oxoniae habita, Aliaeque Doctas Virorum Opellae Posthumae, ex ipsis Authorum Autographis desumptae, quarum Syllabum sequens pagina Lectori exhibet* (Oxford, 1658), pp. 32-34. The earlier version varies, as usual, in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization, but this time only very slightly in wording. Yet it does differ enough to show that Cowley reconsidered the poem before republishing it.⁷

ALBERTA TURNER

Oberlin, Ohio

⁴ A. R. Waller, ed. *The English Writings of Abraham Cowley* (Cambridge, 1905-06), I, v-vi, 22-24.

⁵ 18 Did onely speak,	133 The gain of Warres at home
19 This perfect Concord	138 such mad quarrels of our
115 bloud is spilt, which may be	Isle,
said,	139 vast hopes
120 fear no hurt	142 en'mies from afarre
123 Their Armour	150 souls more high
125 [In the miscellany stanzas	161 gave t'us
4 and 5 are reversed]	162 It bid
126 shore?	164 And we, who write in verse,
132 That, and it's Master Charles,	foretell, not guesse
⁶ Waller, <i>op. cit.</i> , I, v-vi, 402-404, 461	
⁷ 120 depth's unfathom'd pit	155 scourges, rude embraces?
145 and tear/ Thy garments	160 Open, ah open wide

A MISDATED FLAUBERT LETTER

In the two principal editions of Flaubert's correspondence,¹ there is found a letter to his mother from Athens, dated January 26, 1851. The year and month are correct, but the day is inaccurate. In the opening paragraph, Flaubert writes ". . . nous partons dans quelques jours pour le Péloponèse." As the departure took place on January 24,² the letter must have been written around January 20. This misdating—chargeable to the carelessness of either Flaubert or the editors—is further evidence of the caution which must be exercised in using Flaubert's *Correspondance*. Dumesnil has made clear that the Conard edition is not to be relied upon, but he has not been able to improve upon it very much in his editing of the Centenaire edition.³

In the same letter, for *Mouraddi* read *Morandi*. This error, typical of Flaubert, has already been pointed out.

B. F. BART

Pomona College

 REVIEWS

Georg Rudolf Weckherlin. Zur Kenntnis seines Lebens in England
 Von LEONARD WILSON FORSTER. Basler Studien zur deutschen
 Sprache und Literatur 2. Herausgeg. von Fr. Ranke und
 Walter Muschg. Basel 1944.

The German poet Georg Rudolf Weckherlin is not one of those authors of the Baroque period who have been unduly neglected by the literary historians. From 1803, when C. P. Conz published his *Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften Rudolph Weckherlins* the interest in Weckherlin grew throughout the 19th century. His poems were edited by Karl Goedecke in 1873, and in his

¹ *Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert, Édition du Centenaire*, Paris, Librairie de France, 1925, and *Nouvelle Édition augmentée*, Paris, Conard, 1926-33.

² G. Flaubert, *Notes de voyages*, 2 vols., Paris, Conard, 1910, cf. II, 134. Also Maxime Du Camp, *Souvenirs littéraires*, 2 vols., Paris, Hachette, 1883, cf. I, 549.

³ R. Dumesnil, "Note liminaire" to the *Correspondance* for the *Édition du Centenaire*, the same material is given in Chapter VII of his *En marge de Flaubert*, Paris, Librairie de France, 1927.

introduction Goedecke gave a biographical sketch which is still essentially correct although new source material has been found and, in part, published. Later a solid basis for a biography of the poet was laid by Hermann Fischer who published a goodly number of articles and new source material on his "Landsmann" Weckherlin between 1890 and 1900. Among the American students of Weckherlin Aaron Schaffer, with his dissertation *Georg Rudolf Weckherlin: The Embodiment of a Transitional Stage in German Metrics*, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, 1918, deserves to be mentioned. More recently the dissertation of Hans Gaitanides, *Georg Rudolf Weckherlin: Versuch einer physiognomischen Stilanalyse*, München, 1936, presented a convincing interpretation of Weckherlin's poetry. Gaitanides employed the new methods of analysis which Leo Spitzer introduced so admirably in his stylistic studies.

The study of L. W. Forster is based on a great wealth of source material, much of it still unpublished. However, his intention is not to present us with a desirable exhaustive biography and literary evaluation of the poet. He gives us a new outline of Weckherlin's life, with more details and facts, to be sure, but still with many guesses and uncertainties. The main piece of the Weckherlin papers found in the family archives of the Marquess of Downshire is his *Diary*, a beautiful leather-bound volume of 94 pages. According to Forster it is not a diary in a literary sense. It contains mainly notes on his official and private correspondence and only a few remarks about personal affairs and experiences. Its value as a biographical source, it seems to me, is rather limited. And that seems to be true of almost all the unpublished material. It does not give us the answers to many open questions in Weckherlin's biography. Forster is not in a position, for instance, to give a definite answer to the question why Weckherlin transferred his residence to England. Fischer thought he left Stuttgart because he did not earn enough in the duke's service to support his family. Forster who is inclined to see Weckherlin as an idealist disregards the material reasons and suggests that the uncompromising Protestant Weckherlin was dissatisfied with his government's policy of neutrality toward the Catholics. There can be no doubt about Weckherlin's strong Protestantism, but we also know that he was looking out for his own material well-being. He saw to it that he received his compensation for his service to the English government. The obvious and determined flattery of royal personalities in his poems cannot be explained only by the literary custom and taste of the period. He like the other court poets expects favors and material gain for his flowery poems. I see no reason to deny this fact. That his wife was English and her family willing and in a position to offer them shelter at least until he found a suitable position in England is taken into account by Forster only in a footnote.

After comparing Forster's careful study with the already existing biographical outlines I find that many new details are revealed but that there are no startling corrections of our previous knowledge.

of Weckherlin's life Forster's first chapter *Die Familie Weckherlin* offers no new facts, it is entirely based on Conz', Goedecke's and Fischer's publications The second chapter *Jugend und Reisejahre* contains likewise nothing new nor does he fill the obscure holes in our knowledge about Weckherlin's travels Forster relies in this chapter very strongly on Hermann Fischer's contributions to the biography of Weckherlin In the third chapter *Der Hofpoet* Forster confirms in the main the results of earlier publications by Fischer, Hoepfner and Gaitanides on this subject

In 1619 Weckherlin and his family were in England where he remained until his death We know very little about the first eight years of his life in England Forster assumes with others that he was in a kind of secret service for the Duke of Wurttemberg and later for the Palatinate The real nature of this service is unknown and personally I am very doubtful about it Why should they engage a man as their agent who had no intimate knowledge of, nor connections with the English court? What kind of service could he fulfill? We know that he was trying hard to find a position in the English postal service and at the Swedish Court and that he lived in Dover at his father-in-law's house Forster has made it certain that he found a position in 1627 as secretary to the Secretary of State Lord Conway At the end of this chapter Forster compares Weckherlin's attitude toward economic matters with the opportunism of Martin Opitz who offered his service to anyone willing to pay him Weckherlin, Forster says, remained loyal to the Protestant cause while Opitz accepted the pay of a bitter enemy of Protestantism That shows the difference in character, Forster concludes. However, I think the comparison is entirely unfair Weckherlin had married into a Protestant English family, lived with this family at a time when it would have been suicide in England to offer his service to a Catholic party I do not assume that he would have offered to serve a Catholic elsewhere but the fact that he remained in Protestant service cannot be interpreted as a proof of pure character

In the chapter *Ämtliche Tätigkeit* Forster shows that Weckherlin remained in England an ardent German patriot and Protestant. He admits, however, that the poet in 1630, after the Battle of Breitenfeld, lost his hope that England would help the Protestant cause in Germany. It is significant that he did not leave the English service In fact he and his two children became English subjects in 1630, and he suppressed his disappointment over England's attitude toward continental Protestantism

Weckherlin's position as a secretary to the secretary of state seems to have been of relatively little importance It was in the main the position of a clerk and his task was to copy official letters and documents and sometimes translations of different kind He often complains about "subjection to slavery" and expresses hopes for a better position which were never fully realized

Forster's description of Weckherlin's private life is brief, however, there are rather long excursions on other personalities. What he has to say concerning "Die geistlichen und weltlichen Gedichte von 1641" does not add much to the existing interpretations nor does it contribute much material for Weckherlin's biography, as he intends to do according to his introduction.

The value of Forster's study lies in the systematic presentation of the biographical facts, not in his often inconclusive interpretation of the material concerning the life and work of this German poet in England. I am reluctant to agree with Forster's statement that Weckherlin is a literary personality of strong character who stands alone at a turning point of western civilisation and an epoch.

G. F. MERKEL

University of Cincinnati

The Dramas of Heinrich von Kleist By E. L. STAHL *Modern Language Studies* Oxford, Blackwell, 1948 Pp vii, 144

Mr Stahl's principal aim in writing a short book on Kleist's dramas was to give a general rather than a detailed account. Consequently he purposely omitted discussion of aspects of Kleist's work "which have received particular attention in the best known books on the subject." In view of the numerous detailed books on Kleist it is somewhat perplexing to determine what aspects might well be omitted on this basis.

Mr Stahl's book is, on the whole, a solid presentation of considerable merit, yet its announced limitations make for narrowness of treatment and for serious omissions. With twenty-six pages taken up by translations of German quotations, a chronological table of Kleist's life and works, a select bibliography and an index, there remain but 117 pages of text.

The select bibliography omits publications on Kleist in the United States since 1925. Quotations are from the first rather than the revised edition of *Heinrich von Kleists Werke*, edited by Georg Munde-Pouet.

An introduction presents the development of Kleist's dramatic art and of his views on life and human nature, his conception of tragedy, and comparisons with other dramatists, notably Goethe, Schiller, Grillparzer and Ludwig. The author draws at considerable length on Kleist's letters and essays. One might wish for a more incisive presentation of the grievous conflict precipitated by the clash of Kantian philosophy with Kleist's early, uncritical, enthusiastic acceptance of Leibnizian ideas on human perfectibility.

In his analyses of Kleist's dramas the author makes numerous comparisons between earlier and later versions. He deals at much greater length with *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Amphitryon*,

Penthesilea and *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* than with the other dramas

Mr Stahl inclines to the belief that *Robert Guiskard*, which does lie outside the general line of dramatic development foreshadowed by *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, is Kleist's first drama. Herein he differs from numerous scholars like Bonafous, Meyer-Benfey, Minde-Pouet, Rotteken, Silz and Witkop.

The poetically tragic nature of the inner conflict in *Alkmene* is well presented. It is regrettable that the author omitted analysis of the unusual structure of *Der zerbrochene Krug*, one of the leading comedies in German literature. The skill with which Kleist, throughout the play, interwove the exposition with the development of the action itself is deserving of consideration. Moreover, the sources of comic effect might well have been presented in greater detail. In *Das Kathchen von Heilbronn* there is little attempt at characterization of personages other than Kunigunde. The analysis of this drama, which to be sure has very obvious weaknesses, fails to give an impression of the picturesque scenes of medieval life, the colorful background of knighthood, the gorgeous pomp of royal procession, and the ineffable sweetness, charm, and grace of its little heroine. Nor is anything said about the unevenness of style, of rhetorical bombast alternating with simplicity.

Mr Stahl does not point out incisively that in Kleist's last two dramas earlier individualism has given way to the service of the state, to a collective ideal which transcends his earlier attitude and endows life with new meaning. In his analysis of *Die Hermannsschlacht* the author makes no reference to Kleist's *Germania an ihre Kinder*, *Katechismus der Deutschen*, and *Was gilt es in diesem Kriege* which were intended for publication in the proposed patriotic journal *Germania*. These writings shed light on the patriotic fervor which animated Kleist. Judged by our ethical standards Hermann, a warrior of pagan antiquity, is indeed barbarously cruel, yet in dealing with a ruthless invader, usurper, and oppressor he endeavors to eliminate every contradictory impulse in his own nature. In discussing Kleist's use of somnambulism (p. 105), the author fails to observe that Kleist draws the veil from the souls of characters and bares their inmost being by stripping all inhibitions from them in a somnambulist state. This is an important device in characterization.

More emphatic comments would be welcome on Kleist's unusual style, his uneven periods, irregular choppy meter, broken lines and the changing tempo which are so expressive of the nervous torment of his unhappy life and of the conflicts waged by his struggling characters in search of poise.

Mr Stahl has done much in limited compass, his style is clear and direct, his book is a very readable brief introduction to Kleist.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

Damome und Verklarung, von REINHOLD SCHNEIDER Liechtenstein Verlag, Vaduz, 1947. 375 pp.

Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert, Ausdruck und Grosse, von RUDOLF KASSNER Eugen Rentsch Verlag, Erlenbach-Zurich, 1947 363 pp

Es ist im Laufe der letzten Jahre immer deutlicher geworden, daß die Bemühungen um eine neue Deutung des 19. Jahrhunderts — eine unserer Hauptaufgaben zurzeit — Goethes *Faust* in den Mittelpunkt der Betrachtung zu stellen haben. Nicht der Turnvater Jahn, nicht Wagner oder Nietzsche, an die man sich bisher immer wieder gerne gehalten hat, sondern *Faust*, und zwar so wie ihn das 19. Jahrhundert für sich interpretiert hatte und von dem Kassner meint, er sei "dessen eigentlicher Mythos und größte Figur," enthält das Wesentliche des Jahrhunderts.

Reinhold Schneiders Essays wollen, dem beigefügten Vorwort zufolge, ausdrücklich ein Beitrag zu dieser Neudeutung sein, sind es aber doch nur zum Teil. Es sei rundheraus gesagt: Schneider ist so ausschliesslich in katholischem Denken befangen, daß er sich, bei all seiner Bemühung um Objektivität (auf der Grundlage seines Credo), immer wieder in Argumente abschieben läßt, wo alles nur auf den Glauben des Lesers ankommt. Kleist etwa (in dem Essay "Kleists Ende") sieht er einerseits als einen menschlichen Protest des Preußen gegen das heraufkommende Preußentum des neuen Jahrhunderts, aber zugleich auch als das heinahe natürliche Schicksal des "Ungläubigen", bei ersterem horchen wir auf, bei letzterem fühlen wir uns nicht zuständig. Am objektivsten bleibt Schneider fraglos in seinem Goethe-Essay, weil ihm in Faust-Goethe das allgemeine deutsche Menschentum zur Diskussion steht, und es gelingt ihm deswegen, über den Charakter des Helden und dessen innere Beziehung zum Fragwürdigen des deutschen Nationalcharakters wichtige Aufschlüsse zu geben. — Die übrigen Essays befassen sich mit Schillers Wallenstein, Holderlins Deutschlandbild, mit Novalis und seiner Idee vom Tode, der religiösen Umkehr Brentanos, mit Lenau, der Droste, Eichendorff und Grillparzer. Besonders eindrucksvoll (in seiner geradezu dichterischen Qualität) ist der Lenau-Essay, am schwachsten sonderbarerweise die Darstellung Eichendorffs.

Zu einer Gesamtschau des Jahrhunderts kommt Schneider mit dieser Sammlung von Einzeldarstellungen natürlich nicht. Kassner hat sich dazu ganz anders vom individualistischen Moment freimachen und den großen geistigen Hintergründen zustreben können, so daß sein Buch fraglos zu dem Bedeutendsten geworden ist, was unsere Zeit zu diesem Thema bisher zu sagen gehabt hat. Es ist so reich an Erkenntnissen und Anregungen, daß an dieser Stelle nicht einmal ein alles andeutender Hinweis versucht werden kann. *Faust* erscheint ihm als der geistig-künstlerische Grundstein, auf dem das ganze Jahrhundert weitergebaut hat. Durch ihn wurde der

Genie-Begriff in den Personlichkeitskultus hinübergeführt, der einerseits zum ich-haftten Kunstlertum und andererseits zu dem alle große Form ersetzenden Dilettantismus des Jahrhunderts ausgewachsen sei. An die Stelle des Mythos (und *Faust* wäre dessen letzte Ausprägung gewesen) sei diesem Jahrhundert des Romans, der Musik und der Oper die Geschichte getreten. Besonders anregend ist die Gegenüberstellung des 19. Jahrhunderts mit dem des Barock. Die eigentliche Krise der Zeit verlegt Kassner ungefähr in dessen Mitte und bezeichnet sie als eine "Gleichgewichtsstörung" als Abgleiten des Idealismus in den Liberalismus (Hegel), und sieht sie am deutlichsten manifestiert in dem Aufkommen der Psychologie (Schopenhauer).

Die Frage muß aufgeworfen werden, ob dieses Jahrhundert, wie Kassner es nachzeichnet, wirklich das "deutsche" genannt zu werden verdient. Trotz aller Parallelen zur außerdeutschen Kultur und Dichtung ist es doch ausschließlich das Problem Deutschland, mit dem er sich befaßt, und man kann in diesen deutschen "Noten" doch keineswegs immer auch gemein europäische wiedererkennen. Unbehaglich ist ferner das fast ganzliche Absehen von ökonomischen und soziologischen Faktoren, ohne die die brillianteste Analyse letzten Endes im luftleeren Raume hängen bleiben muß.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

Smith College

The Sources of A Dictionary of the French and English Tongues
By Randle Cotgrave (London, 1611) *A Study in Renaissance Lexicography* By VERA E. SMALLEY. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1948. (*The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages* Extra Volume xxv, pp. 252.)

This review is too brief to laud properly Dr. Smalley's splendid achievement. Despite the arduous labor, she finds fascination in the pursuit of lexicography as did Cotgrave himself (see, e. g., his unmentionable article *arbaleste*). The investigation was interrupted constantly, but she persevered. Now she can justify her conclusions amply. The main source is Nicot's 1606 French revision of Robert Estienne's 1549 French-Latin rather than Holyband's 1593 French-English. Contemporaneous bilingual dictionaries were exploited by Cotgrave for many terms which lexicographers still date 1611, and the 1587 Latin-English vocabulary of Thomas Thomas was the most serviceable. A large proportion of Cotgrave's innovations, approximately 15,000, are technical terms of medicine, natural history, trade, and especially law (Ragueau's index, first edited in 1583, was reprinted in 1882). As for polyglot lexica, she lists (page 100) only four of the eleven languages offered to translate the *Dictionarium* of Calepinus in 1590.

To study Cotgrave's harvest from French literature, she profits by recent glossaries for Rabelais, Du Bartas, and Olivier de Serres, who are among Cotgrave's thirty-two acknowledged sources, but she overlooks (pages 11, 217) the individual glossaries for Amyot, d'Aubigné, Belon, Lemaire de Belges, Marot, Montaigne, Noel du Fail, Ronsard, and Vauquelin de la Fresnaie enumerated in the *Répertoire des lexiques du vieux français* (pages 54-57).

The documentation is somewhat inadequate. Omitted titles, closely akin to those given on pages 9, 10, 51, 52, 59, 98, 240, include Didot, *Observations* . . ., and Schwartz, *Die Worterbucher* . . ., listed in *PMLA*, LXII (1947), 556, Dauzat, *Dictionnaire étymologique* . . ., Starnes, *University of Texas Studies in English*, XVII (1937), 15-51, and XIX (1939), 114-138, Victor, *Thresor des trois langues* (1606), Heymann, *Zts frz Spr Lit*, XXXV (1910), 306-324, Rider, *Bibliotheca Scholastica* (1589, first revised by Holyoke in 1606), Huguet, *Mots disparus seizième siècle*. Strangely, La Curne, who compiled his Old French dictionary in the eighteenth century, is called a "modern lexicographer," but nowhere is mention made of Tobler-Lommatzsch, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*.

Because of the changing conditions and uneven quality of Cotgrave's *Dictionary*, the arbitrary decision to take all the A-headings and others only when necessary may seem less convincing than a *passim* plan, eclectic even if similar quantitatively. The minority offers more latitude: *bariagoun* (p. 22) is derived differently by Spitzer, *Arch Rom*, II vol. 3 (1922), 140, by Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch . . . oriental Ursprungs*, p. 21, by Bloch, s. v., *boucon* (cited in 1568) was used in the fifteenth century according to Stevens (who incidentally quotes Cotgrave often) in *La Langue de Brantôme*, p. 112, *dieutelet* (cited in 1588) is found in Pierre de Brach, *fruoler, garse, questuaire* (cited from the dictionaries of Holyband, Meurier, Thomas) were also used by Calvin, Maurice de la Porte, Montaigne. Furthermore, Oudin (p. 91) deserves credit for *bien-en-allée* and *capettes*, while the elusive *hamesson* (p. 92) can be found in Nicot, art. *haem*, Palsgrave, *L'Esclaircissement*, p. 18, Jamyn, *Oeuvres*, p. 161, Montaigne, *Essays*, III 5, Olivier de Serres, *Theatre* . . . (the 1941 edition is not mentioned) 995.

Minor details. The University of Texas owns four editions of Cotgrave (p. 33), on the 1650 title-page, one does find "Printed by W. H. for Iohn Williams." The legal authority Beaumanoir (p. 164) also composed poems (edited by Suchier in 1885) and songs (edited by Jeanroy in 1897). Misprints were noticed on pages 71 (1584), 96 (*accotement* 72a), 125 (1565), 222 (Part II. *Dictionnaire* . . .), 249 (Amyot 201. Andernacht 140-9).

These strictures can not detract from the general utility and valid conclusions of Dr. Smalley's laborious quest in Renaissance lexicography.

RAPHAEL LEVY

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

NOVEMBER, 1949

Number 7

TO GET / BE INVITED

That the passive construction with *get*¹ has, today, no special nuance of its own (except, perhaps, its colloquial flavor) to distinguish it from that with *be*, is apparently taken for granted by most

¹ According to the *NED*, the use of *get* as passive auxiliary is to be explained as an extension of its use with adjectives (and adjectival participles) *to get free, to get drunk*. And the type *to get free* is explained, in turn, from the use of intransitive *get* as a verb of movement (*to get away, to get to the shore*—which last, perhaps, goes back to the use of transitive *get* as a verb of movement of the obsolete *to get the shore*)

It is of course the third stage which distinguishes *get* from other copulas of 'becoming' (*turn, go, grow, wax*—and, for the most part, the verb *become* itself see below). But what is the difference between an adjectival participle and one with true verbal force—in our case, with true *passive* verbal force? There are, perhaps, two criteria of distinction: on the one hand, we have the type (of emotional reaction) *he got upset, he got irritated* etc., where the participle refers clearly to the effect of a passive action (one must be upset, irritated, *by* something or someone, before one can "get upset, irritated"), but, since we are apt to be more interested in the emotional condition reached by the subject than in the activity of the agent productive of this condition, such participles may be felt as adjectives (in contrast to *he got paid, he got fired*)—and usually are, unless we are forced by the context to concentrate on the agent's activity (*she was continually being annoyed by . . .*), in which case *get* will hardly be found. We may also consider the participle *accustomed* as an adjective in *he got accustomed to . . .*, for we are seldom interested in "what has accustomed" a person: the type "he was accustomed *by hard work* to expect . . ." is the exception.

On the other hand, there are many cases in which the so-called passive participles with *get* (or *be*) reflect no passive action whatsoever. This is obviously true of *he got drunk, finished, caught up with his work, he got used to . . .*, where the participle describes the result of the subject's own (transitive or intransitive) activity. Again, the participle may point back to activity performed by the subject upon himself: we have regularly to do with reflexive activity in *she got fixed up, he got dressed, shaved* (for

grammarians^{1a} The only distinction made by Jespersen (*MEG*, iv, 108-12) and Curme (*Syntax*, 446) is that between state and action *be* + participle may, obviously, refer either to a "Statal Passive" (*the house is painted*) or an "Actional Passive" (*the house is painted every year* to use the terms and examples of Curme), but *get*, because of its ingressive aspect must be limited exclusively to the latter²—and, accordingly, represents a convenient device to avoid ambiguity

The two grammarians differ somewhat in their opinion as to the necessity of this device Curme would seem to suggest that the

the passive idea, the expression *to get a shave* is preferred), *they got settled*, *he got lost* Since these types could never (or rarely) be paraphrased by "someone dressed, shaved, settled, lost him," I should say that it is not correct to speak here of *get* as a passive auxiliary

Finally, there are some participles which refer to an activity for which a verb no longer exists in *he got acquainted*, the participle comes from an obsolete intransitive 'to acquaint with another', in *she got engaged*, from an obsolete (or obsolescent) reflexive 'to engage oneself to another' But never in their history have these two participles been used to refer to the passive action of *'being acquainted by s o' or *'being engaged [to marry] by s o' (As for *to get married*, see note 13)

Are, then, such participles as the last three types to be considered as adjectives? Until a third category is invented, I see no other way And since the use of *get* with true passive participles is paralleled by no other auxiliary, except *be* (see note 13), the real nature of this verb is obscured if we include such examples as *he got finished*, *lost*, *acquainted* together with *he got paid* = 'some one paid him' and *he got fired* = 'someone fired him' (The *NED*, however, lists *get acquainted* as the first attestation of "*get* + p p," in which category it also includes *he got used to* [though *he got drunk* is (rightly) listed under 'adjectival complement'], Jespersen, in addition to *get acquainted*, includes also *to get engaged*, *accus-tomed*—and even *he got finished*')

^{1a} That a stylistic difference does exist between *be* and *get* is recognized, to some extent, by Mildred E. Lambert, in a brief comment included in one of her studies on predication ("Studies in Stylistics," iv, *American Speech*, iv [1929], p. 143), but her remarks are too summary and vague to offer more than a hint of the possibilities of *get* She speaks of "forcefulness," "vitality," "emphasis" [emphasis on what?], she states that some of the original meaning of 'acquiring or receiving' still continues in the auxiliary *get* (without seeking to show how this may influence the concept of a passive action)—and, of course, mentions the limitation to ingressive aspect insisted upon exclusively, and unduly, by Curme and Jespersen (see below)

² These same grammarians might also have noted that, because of its ingressive aspect, *get* is impossible in reference not only to state but also to durative action one would never say "he got watched, followed, liked, etc."

construction with *be* is inevitably ambiguous—or, rather, that it has an inherent reference to state, a congenital inability to insist on action.³ But this means that he disregards completely (or else, wrongly interprets) such constructions as *the man was run over, introduced, arrested, fired, put in jail, elected*—where a static interpretation is impossible. When, in such statements, *be* is replaced by *get*, there has been not the slightest heightening of emphasis on activity—so that we must suppose that the substitution in question has been “unnecessary,” and quite meaningless. We are also invited to suppose (by Jespersen) that this, often meaningless, substitution is freely available: that *get* (except in the most formal style) may be used at will to replace *be* as passive auxiliary, so long as there is no reference to state (or durative action).

But it should be obvious that this is not the case. We will find “he *got* fired” but “he *was* fired by the superintendent”, “he *got* run over,” but “he *was* run over in cold blood”, “he *got* arrested,” but “he *was* arrested on false charges” (or “he *was* arrested the next morning in his house”), “she *got* introduced to General Eisenhower” but “she *was* then introduced to the guests”, “ever since he *got* elected, he’s been stuck-up” but “ever since he *was* elected, things have gone much better”. Nor can one easily imagine, in any context, the replacement of *be* by *get* in such statements as “he was tried, approached, slandered, announced, hindered”. As a matter of fact, the use of *get* as passive auxiliary is greatly limited (I have been able to go through a half-dozen modern plays without finding a single example), and, when it is used, we may be sure that it has a nuance of its own much more significant than its obvious (and usually unnecessary) emphasis on ingressive aspect. In order to determine what this nuance is we must, of course, seek to analyze the nature of the restrictions on its use.

The most clear-cut limitation is seen in the difficulty of adding

³ This was, of course, once true of the verb *be*. in order to express the idea of an “actional passive,” the ingressive *weorðan* was necessary. And Curme, who compares modern *get* with the OE *weorðan*—and who even seems to see in the former a mystical rebirth of the latter—is thinking in terms of a system which no longer exists. For, along with the disappearance of *weorðan*, the static *be* grew steadily in ingressive force—to the extent, indeed, that, in the case of many verbs, a static interpretation has become absolutely impossible (who would say, today **the tables are removed*, **the man is run over*?) Curme’s attempted distinction would only put back the clock by many centuries.

the preposition *by* + name of [human] agent "he got fired by the superintendent" is hardly possible.⁴ And this formal limitation must be indicative of a restriction to a particular type of passive action since, when *get* is used as auxiliary, the agent of the passive action is rarely named as such, this must mean that his rôle in this action is subordinated—that the agent does not completely dominate the situation—the subject, himself, having a chance to modify or determine, in some way or to some degree, what happens to him.

This is obviously the case in such examples as "Well, I think I'll go get examined," "have you gotten vaccinated yet?" where the subject himself (usually) initiates the activity, using the agent as a means to his own ends. This use of *get*, however, is rare.⁵ The usual type (with which this article is mainly concerned) is that represented by *he got invited* or *he got run over*, where there is no suggestion whatsoever that the subject has deliberately induced an agent to act upon him, indeed, in the second example, the passive action is one which a person in his right senses would surely never

⁴It is of course quite possible to say "he got hit on the head *with a stone*" and even "he got kicked *by a mule*, bitten *by a snake*, run over *by an automobile*" As for reference to a human agent, I would say that this depends somewhat on the degree to which this agent is individualized. "he got run over *by a drunken driver*" might be said, but hardly "he got run over *by the man next door*" In the first case, with indefinite article, the agent is suddenly created, out of thin air, as it were, so that his tenuous existence may be tolerated (Jespersen, however, quotes from Dickens the example "he got killed by the other four")

⁵I should say that it is limited to cases (like the two just cited) in which the activity of the (unnamed) agent is of a routine, professional nature. Otherwise, in reference to passive activity initiated by the subject, we will find a reflexive construction either *to have oneself* *ed* (*he had himself paged, he had himself let out the back way*—one could also say *he had himself examined*) or *to get oneself* *ed* (*he got himself elected, he got himself invited*). In the case of *get* + reflexive, there is regularly a facetious or pejorative nuance, as if to imply that the subject has used questionable means to induce the final passive action. This is no doubt due to the more energetic force of *get*—which presents the subject as a "go-getter." In the two 18th-century examples of this construction cited by the *NED* there is reflected rather amusement or condescending pity at the effort expended by the subject [the first of these representing probably a reflexive rather than a passive situation] "La Fleur had got himself so gallantly arrayed, I scarce knew him" (Stern, 1768), "Poor Barty . . . had applied, and got himself appointed a writer to the East India Company" (1779)

seek to provoke—and this is by far the more frequent context in which *get* as passive auxiliary is found

He got left behind, locked out
 he got stepped on, knocked down, hurt, shot, killed, beaten up,
 hit over the head
 he got fooled, gyped, cheated
 he got caught, found out, arrested, punished, called down, fined,
 kept in, fired, blamed

Here, where the action undergone by the subject is of such an undesirable nature, it may seem difficult to grant him any degree of freedom to "modify or determine" what has happened to him.

It may be said, however, that if a person finds himself in any of the predicaments listed above, it is apt to be the result, to some degree, of his carelessness (if not of actual misbehavior), and we tend to feel that such accidents might have been avoided, with greater foresight or virtue on the part of the subject. This is much more evident in e g *he got fired* than in *he got run over*,⁶ *he got held up*, but, even here, there is at least a vague suggestion of the subject's responsibility, of his "potential" ability to have prevented such a situation,—for, if we attempt to imagine the exceptional cases in which the subject is meant to be entirely absolved, *get* will not be used surely, it would be impossible to say "he got run over *in cold blood*"—or "he got fired unjustly," "he got arrested *on false charges*." Somewhat similarly, we will find "she *got* talked about" (as the result of indiscreet, if innocent behavior) but only "she *was, has been* slandered", "he *got* held up in his work" but only "he *was* hindered from working" with *slandered* and *hindered*, the subject is presented as a helpless victim of mischievous activity. And, given this suggestion of inevitability, *get* would not be fitting.⁷

⁶In *he got run over* (and also in *he got locked out, left behind, he got stepped on*) the activity of the agent has (usually) been committed with out deliberate intent. But, the majority of cases are of the type *he got fired, beaten up* etc, where the agent acts deliberately (and still, is not presented as completely controlling the fate of the subject).

⁷This is not to say that the type *he got run over* is meant to suggest conspicuous carelessness on the part of the subject. It is not intended as a positive statement of a given individual's responsibility in a given situation—only as a vague suggestion of the "generic," the theoretical responsibility which rests on all victims of accidents.

For the more pointed suggestion of responsibility, one may find the reflexive construction with *get*. "So you got yourself kicked out!" "Be

Again, it would be impossible to use this auxiliary in such a context as "he was starting to cross the street when two masked men came out of the alley toward him he *was* held up and robbed of fifty dollars" or "as she dashed out into the street after her ball, a car suddenly turned the corner the child *was* immediately run over" We have said that such misfortunes as "getting run over" etc. are usually thought of as avoidable, but this is apt to be true only when they are referred to without context when the happening is presented either as hypothetical ("look out, or you'll get . . .") or as something for which the listener is unprepared ("Have you heard about John? He just got . . .") Obviously, something which has not yet happened may be considered unavoidable, and the same may be true of a past event which is abstracted from the particular situation out of which it grew Generally speaking, the average citizen has many chances, according to statistics, not to get run over, held up or arrested But, at the moment the thugs accost him, the automobile turns the corner (or the policeman claps him on the shoulder), the law of averages does him no good fitted within its context, the "accident" appears as inevitable (and *get* may not be used)⁸ In the sentence, "did you hear that Tom got held up last night?", it is "Tom in general," the perennial Tom (the Tom who has a chance *not* to be held up) who is presented to us Tom apart from any situation of the moment

careful or you'll get yourself killed!" Now this reflexive construction was, obviously, intended originally to refer to deliberate purposeful action, and may still be so used (for example, to *get oneself killed* may also refer to an act prompted by suicidal motives—as in Maxwell Anderson's *Storm Operation* "Simeon's dead He never wanted to come back down that hill I knew when we started up *He didn't get himself killed*, mind you It just happened" *Best Plays of 1943* 44, p. 310) And, precisely because of this strong original emphasis on the initiative of the subject, the extension to an 'accidental' reference must be considered as due to heavy irony "So you worked hard to get yourself kicked out you succeeded in getting yourself kicked out!" or "(if you keep on that way) you'll do a fine job of getting yourself killed!" (cf. also Fr., "vous allez vous faire tuer!") Thus, in the type "so, you got yourself kicked out!" the driving force of the go-getter ("he got himself elected") has proved a boomerang

⁸In this connection we may be reminded of the restriction attendant upon the use of the reflexive in French, in reference to a predicament which the subject has accidentally brought upon himself one may say of a child who has been hurt by his comrades in a game "*il s'est blessé*", but one could use only *il fut blessé* in reference to the actual moment at which he was hurt

(and this is the way we ordinarily think of individuals, unless we are forced to do otherwise by the context or the situation). To this Tom, we are always ready to allow a certain leeway by this autonomous, timeless person, thought of in terms of his career as a whole, any particular incident might have been avoided. But Tom-at-a-given-moment, is another kind of being, and whatever happens to him had to happen—according to laws quite unrelated to his being.

Now, it might be said that in the two examples just cited, the agent (masked men, automobile) has been referred to (though only as agent-to-be), and that it is for this reason that *get* is impossible. But I would say that the real agent is the actual situation: the subject of the passive verb is dominated by the “moment” as well as by the so-called agents. At any rate, it is true that *get* may never be used *when the passive action is inserted into the flow of events*—even when no agent is seen lurking in the wings. “for the next few days he stayed with friends and managed to escape detection, the third night, he went back to his family, and the next morning early he was arrested in his home.” It is difficult to imagine “*the next morning he got arrested*”, once caught within the flow of events, the person in question can be seen only as a “passive” target. But, in “Mrs Jones is nearly distracted, her boy Tom got arrested today for stealing apples,” the subject, Tom, is presented as a free agent (until the moment of his arrest), who has met with an “accident” to us, who see him outside of any immediate context, his arrest has seemed to come out of the blue sky, instead of forming a part of the inexorable march of events (conditioned by timing). Mrs Jones’ boy, Tom, that consistent entity, had any number of chances not to be arrested—or so we optimistically suppose, since we have not seen the situation “closing in” on him.

This does not mean that *get* is never found within a sequence, or that it may never be introduced by any preamble. It is true that it is most often found, without context: either in hypothetical or indefinite references (“don’t get ed,” “you’ll get ed,” “I always get . . . ed”), or in sudden, unprepared announcements which give the gist, the climax of an event which serve to offer “news” rather than narrative (“Have you heard about Tom? He got . . . ed”). But one could well imagine such a presentation as “Tom’s always been a problem, his mother didn’t know how to

manage him all she could think of was holding back his allowance. But then he started taking things—chocolate bars, comics. A few times, she made good the loss, and nothing happened, but finally *he got arrested* and sent to the detention home.”

But this is a summary, not a narrative—it is retrospective, whereas a narrative, having carried us back to a certain point in time, allows us to watch, from this point, the events move *forward* to a certain situation—which has not already happened. But, in the summary just offered, it is taken for granted that Tom’s arrest has already happened (indeed, it may even be taken for granted that this incident is already known to the audience, who are interested only in an explanation)—the speaker, remaining comfortably in the present, looks over his shoulder at the past—he does not, as a narrator would do, insert the happening into a sequence of events in time. “In the next few weeks, Tom became bolder, encouraged by the success of his petty crimes, he decided, at last, to break in the door of the confectionery store, next door. But he had reckoned without the burglar alarm, and he *was arrested* while he was in the midst of filling his pockets. This time he was sentenced to the detention home.” Here, the subject’s arrest and conviction are a part of the network of events in time, against which he is helpless.

The same general limitations obtain when the construction with *get* is used to refer to a fortunate incident in the career of an individual (where, of course, one would hardly think in terms of “coercion by an agent”)—the event must seem, in some way, to some degree, the result of chance (*to get elected, nominated, invited, promoted, to get wanted on, served, to get paid*),⁹ and it must be presented free from the context of a given situation in time. Thus one may say “Oh, I never *get invited* anywhere!”, or “Susie *got invited* to the President’s tea, did you?”, or even (in a summary) “It looked as if I would never get a chance to wear my new evening

⁹ Of this list, it is perhaps the verb *to get paid* which would seem to have the least reference to chance. It may, however, quite easily be a matter of chance just when one gets paid (“we get paid on Tuesday”) or how (“we get paid in cash”) or how much (“we got paid in full”).

It is also true that in *to get wanted on, served*, the subject himself has initiated the passive activity, much as in the type *to get examined*. But I should say, given present day conditions, that such a fortunate outcome as that of *getting wanted on, served* is considered mainly as good luck—the subject being able only to request, to put himself in line for, this service.

dress, nobody asked me out anywhere for weeks, but, just as I was beginning to give up hope, I *got invited* to this dinner." But *get* would not be used in such a narrative sequence as "when her shopping was done, she dropped in at the Smith's. There were several interesting couples there, one of whom took a great liking to her, and she *was invited* to their house for the weekend."

Now it should be noted that *get* will be used only for the two types of events just treated—those felt as having either fortunate or unfortunate consequences for the subject. This construction would be utterly impossible in such non-affective statements as "he was seen [working in the garden]," "they were considered [good friends]," or "she was described [as a hard-working person]." Nor would one normally say "she got sent to school [when she was six]," "he got trained [as a mechanic]," "he got buried [in the family graveyard]," "he got born [in New York]," or "she got introduced [to the hostess]." However, in a different context, perhaps all of these constructions might be possible—e.g. "He has all the luck—he *gets sent* to a private school" or "babies don't *get born* with silver spoons in their mouths any more" or "she *got introduced* to General Eisenhower."¹⁰

This emphasis on good or bad fortune means, of course, that in the construction with *get*, the passive action is presented from the point of view of the subject—it is considered only as something (good or bad) happening to him, a stage in his private career.¹¹ I may say of my friend "Susie got invited to the Smith's" for me, at that moment, the desires and decisions of the hosts, and all the machinery of their social planning do not exist—at least, not independently—an invitation is something which one receives or does not, and which exists only for the recipient. But, to the hosts themselves, a guest who is (or is not) invited is seen as playing a part in their own plans, and Mr. Smith himself could never ask his

¹⁰ An additional reason for not finding *get* in the anodyne situation of 'being presented to one's hostess,' is that the reference to such an event would not be found outside of continuous narrative ("she was *then* presented")—whereas the rest of the factual statements listed above could appear as independent statements, and are restricted to the auxiliary *be* only because of the absence of emotion.

¹¹ It is also for this reason that we are not apt to find *get* used in connection with explanatory details—"he got arrested *in his home*", to a person interested only in the career of the subject, the place of his arrest would be unimportant—at least, when the news is first received.

wife "Did Susie Brown get invited [to our party]?" Or again, we may compare the two sentences quoted at the beginning "ever since he *got* elected Class President, he's been stuck-up" with "ever since he *was* elected Class President, things have been running much more smoothly" In the one case, the election is seen as a personal triumph for the subject, in the second, as an event which affects the interests of the community

To sum up, then the construction with *get* is used only when the subject is presented as free from the coercion of others, free from the timing of events an autonomous (though vulnerable) being, moving within his personal orbit, and it is used only when the passive act represents a happening (an "adventure") which has meaning within this orbit alone For that reason, this construction is not suited to narrative, where every character is seen at a given moment, and against the impersonal background of outer reality, with its own inviolable laws With *get*, each individual lives in his private universe only two things exist the subject and the event—which, by a kind of magnetism, is attracted into the latter's sphere¹² It might be said that our construction is an (auto-) biographical device, which serves to record the experiences of individuals in whom Fate, whether she smiles or frowns, is personally interested

How are we to explain the peculiar nuance of the passive auxiliary *get* in modern English? How, indeed, may we explain that it is used at all as passive auxiliary? That this use may represent the result of the semantic development from 'arrive' to 'become,' as the *NED* suggests, is no real answer to the problem, for the verb *become* itself underwent the same shift of meaning, and yet has never been able to serve as a true passive auxiliary (no more than have *grow*, *wax*, *turn*, *go*, etc.).¹³

¹² The construction with *get* represents a variation of the passive which may, perhaps, be compared to the variation of the *active* offered by the Greek Middle in both, the act is interpreted in terms of its significance for the subject

¹³ Jespersen lists *become* (and even *grow*, *stand*, *rest*) along with *get* as a passive auxiliary—without, of course, attempting to define the restrictions on its use These restrictions are such, in my opinion, as absolutely to exclude it from consideration as a passive auxiliary for *become* may never be used to refer to any *passive action performed by a human agent* (unless, of course, the participle is such as to invite an adjectival interpretation)

The reason is to be sought in the original force of the transitive verb *get*, which is defined by the *NED* as "to obtain possession of as the result of effort or contrivance" (attested from 1200 on). Now it is true that this meaning soon weakened to that of 'receive', in such expressions as (1300) *to get a service, to get one's sight*, the good fortune of the subject is presented not as his own achievement but as something granted him by the kindness of another or of Fate.¹⁴ And, once this emphasis on the "effort or contrivance" of the subject weakens, and he is presented as a mere recipient, we find the third stage of development, in which he appears as the recipient

tation "this tradition became accepted" but not "the present became accepted") never could one say *"he became invited, paid waited on, he became fired, run over, arrested, punished" (even "She became married" seems not to be possible—which proves, perhaps, that in *she got married*, the participle is not to be interpreted adjectively [*she got engaged*], but in line with *she got invited*). Of the several dozens of examples with *get* listed above in the text, not one would tolerate the use of *become*. It is true that I have excluded from consideration such border line cases as *he got accustomed, drunk, lost, engaged*, and here we may indeed find *become* alternating with *get*. But, unlike *get*, *become* is found *only* in border line cases.

And it is perhaps because Jespersen insisted in treating *get* along with *become* and other ingressive auxiliaries that he was unable to find the particular nuance of this verb, though he did not go so far as Curme in his insistence on action vs state, still it was this distinction (copulas of being vs copulas of becoming) which was alone important to him. Because of this, he had to see *get* and *become* as "belonging together," and was blind to the important differences which separated them. These differences are of two sorts: in the first place, there is the distinction between passive (*get*) and semipassive (*become*)—a general distinction which, of course, involves still other possibilities of alternation (*the tree was shaken* vs *the tree shook*) and to which Jespersen has accorded only slight attention in his grammar. In the second place, there is a difference which has nothing to do with general grammatical categories, and which is to be seen only by studying the *meaning* of the verbs treated as individual words (and what a word is *get*!). In syntax, too, "every word has its own history", it is only secondarily that *get* has become a part of the verbal system. Grammarians are apt to look only for paradigms, but once they pin the butterfly into their grammatical frame, all life stops.

¹⁴ There are, of course, intermediary stages between the idea of "obtaining as the result of effort" and that of merely receiving: for example, when one "gets" a (certain) salary, or a price for one's goods, both ideas are inextricably blended, and it may depend on the context which of the two is stressed the more (here, we may be reminded of the in-between stages with *get* as auxiliary: *to get waited on* etc.)

of something undesirable, forced on him by the ill-will of another, or of Fate *to get a fall* (1375), *to get a shove* (1475)

But, for all this "optional" weakening, transitive *get* never lost its original force. And it is this force that we always find (at the beginning) in the different uses which the verb has developed in the last seven centuries or more. When first used intransitively, as a verb of movement, *get* meant actually "*to succeed in coming or going, to bring oneself to, from etc.*" "*get away, get out* (1300), "*Thei han geten on hem the lengthe of a gleyue*" (1375). When, almost three centuries later, we find intransitive *get* used with predicative adjectives, it is, again, with the same insistence on the "effort or contrivance" of the subject *to get clear of debts* (1596), *to get loose from enemies* (1659). The same is true of its use with adjectival participles, which we find by the 17th century "*They were both gotten sufficiently drunk*" (1662), "*a certain Spanish pretending Alchymist got acquainted with foure rich Spanish merchants*" (1652). We may note the presence of *sufficiently* in the first sentence, which presents the intoxication of the subject as an achievement, as for the second, it is easy to surmise that the "pretender" who got acquainted with four "rich" merchants had engineered this meeting. If, then, *get* began to alternate with *become* in such expressions as *to get clear, to get drunk, acquainted*, this must have been because of its suggestion of achievement—of which the other verb was incapable.

Now, it might seem that this very emphasis would preclude the use of *get* as a passive auxiliary—the idea of 'personal achievement' being at the opposite pole from that of being acted upon by an agent. To the contrary, it appears as if the very driving force of *get* was able, as it were, to swing the agent into its orbit to subordinate him to the rôle of acting in the subject's interest. For, the original meaning of *get* as passive auxiliary is not that of submitting to an agent, but of using an agent (as in the examples offered at the beginning *to get examined, vaccinated*) the first definition offered by the *NED* is "*to cause or procure oneself to be treated in a certain way*" . . .¹⁵

¹⁵ It must be admitted that the examples of the *NED* do not illustrate this meaning as clearly as might be desired. The first, *to get acquainted* (1653), must be rejected (as has already been pointed out), since it does not represent a passive construction, the next two examples may be interpreted in accord with the definition of the *NED* *to get moored* (1793),

But, here, too, the emphasis on the initiative of the subject had to weaken, and to undergo the same development noted above with the original construction, transitive *get* + object i.e. (1) to obtain (something desired) by one's own efforts, (2) to receive something desired or desirable through the good-offices of another (or of Fate), (3) to receive something undesirable through the bad offices of another (or of Fate). These three stages are clearly in evidence in the examples of the type *get* + adjective, listed by the *NED*: 1 *to get clear* (1596), 2 *to get better* (1776), 3. *to get lame* (1810). And we must similarly assume that, in the construction with passive participle, the order of development has been from the type *get examined* to *get invited* to *get fired*.¹⁶ Once the agent

to get supplied (1814)—though reflexive interpretation is not excluded. We have obviously to do with a passive expression, however, in the first quotation given by Jespersen (from Fielding): "You may not only save your life, but *get rewarded* for your roguery"—and, very probably, with an emphasis on "the effort or contrivance of the subject."

¹⁶ Would it not be possible, instead, to imagine a development from the original meaning "to obtain as the result of effort or contrivance" to the 'hard luck' type, *to get fired* (by way of irony), just as we have assumed this development for the reflexive type (*to get oneself invited* > *to get oneself kicked out*)? My main reason against such an assumption is the fact that one would then have to derive the 'good luck' type *to get invited* from *to get fired*—a semantic development difficult to imagine (in the case of the reflexive construction, no such 'good luck' type exists: *to get oneself promoted* could only suggest 'effort or contrivance')—Accordingly, it seems more reasonable to assume that *get*, as passive auxiliary, has simply reflected the three-fold development already undergone by the verb in other references.

But there is also a fourth stage of which nothing so far has been said: the use of *get* in reference to an inanimate object. Here, it may be stated briefly, that *get*, as auxiliary, will again refer only to good or bad fortune—though it will obviously not be the fortune of the (inanimate) subject itself that is in question: *the glass got broken*, *the purse got lost*, *the grass [finally] got cut*, *the packages [finally] got delivered*. In the first type, *get* usually (but not always: *my purse got stolen*) insists on the accidental nature of the injury or loss (i.e. accidental from the point of view of the agent); in the second, quite the reverse, there is usually suggested painful effort on the part of the agent.

Indeed, it is possible that the second type is not to be derived from the use of intransitive *get* with animate subject—but is to be explained from the type with transitive *get*: *we finally got the grass cut* > *the grass finally got cut*, *we finally got the packages delivered* > *the packages finally got delivered*, *we don't get anything done around here* > *nothing gets done around here*: that is, the transitive verb is made intransitive, to refer to

has been admitted (at first, as a means to the subject's own ends), he tends to take over the initiative himself—often with disastrous results for the subject

But still, this agent (who can never be mentioned) is not allowed to overshadow the subject, though he may bring him to grief. He can still, somehow, only play into his hands. For the agent, who has no history of his own, is created for the sole purpose of fulfilling the destiny of the subject—who has “gotten what was coming to him.” It is always his story that *get* tells.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

TROIS QUERELLES ET LEURS RENSEIGNEMENTS POUR L'HISTOIRE DU THÉÂTRE FRANÇAIS AU XVII^e SIÈCLE

Trois documents inédits

Les actes notariés ayant fourni matière à cette étude paraissent de prime abord d'importance tout à fait secondaire. Ces minutes font mention de querelles dont certaines ont même dégénéré en rixes. Or ces faits ne peuvent être considérés comme importants. Cependant nous aurions tort de les passer sous silence car elles contiennent des détails permettant de compléter à plus d'un point de vue les connaissances acquises jusqu'à présent sur la vie théâtrale du XVII^e siècle. En outre, dans ces pièces, que le hasard de nos dépouillements nous a fait découvrir, les noms de quelques personnalités ayant joué un rôle dans l'évolution du théâtre de leur temps ont été retrouvés, ce qui nous permettra de les remettre à l'étude.

Le premier acte notarié qui appelle l'attention est celui du 5 juin 1606¹. Il nous apprend que trois jours auparavant Valleran le Conte, Estienne de Ruffin et Hugues Guéru, tous les trois comédiens du roi, se promenaient ensemble à Paris, dans la rue Mon-

the result of the agent's activity, just as in the case of causative verbs in general (*we close the shop at 7.00 > the shop closes at 7.00*)

¹ Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds XV, liasse 16. Voir pièce justificative No 1. Nous faisons suivre l'analyse de ces pièces à la fin de l'article.

torgueil, Jehan Riocrocq, cordonnier, leur barra la route. Une discussion s'en suivit, les poings furent serrés et les épées tirées

à deux reprises le cordonnier fut touché. Celui-ci ne se laissa pas faire et exigea une indemnité. Le 5 juin les quatre batailleurs se trouvent dans l'étude du notaire Cuvillyer, Valleran, de Ruffin et Guéru y payent la somme de huit livres tournois au cordonnier et ce dernier déclare acquitter ses trois antagonistes de tous autres dommages et intérêts

Ce simple récit nous dévoile un secret. Nous savons que Valleran le Conte et son poète attitré Alexandre Hardy sont venus, dans l'année 1606, pour la seconde fois à Paris et que, dans cette ville, Valleran avait adjoint² à la troupe qui l'accompagnait deux jeunes acteurs, Estienne de Ruffin et Alexandre du Mesnil. Il n'est signalé nulle part quels étaient les comédiens qui faisaient partie à ce moment de cette bande. Les premières données concernant la composition de celle-ci nous les tirons du bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne du 6 août 1607³ trouvé par Fransen. L'accord du 5 juin révèle maintenant que Hugues Guéru a aussi participé à la rixe dans la rue Montorgueil. On peut en conclure qu'il était déjà membre de la troupe de Valleran à ce moment-là, ce comédien qui acquerra plus tard tant de célébrité comme farceur à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne sous le nom de Gaultier Garguille n'a donc pas, ainsi que M. Magne, son biographe,⁴ l'a supposé, commencé sa profession d'acteur en 1615, ni même en 1607, date avancée par Fransen, mais ses débuts doivent être placés antérieurement à 1606, il est hors de doute qu'il a figuré parmi les membres de la troupe venue à Paris avec Valleran en cette dernière année.

Dans la seconde querelle il n'est question que de deux personnes. La première est Mathieu Le Febvre, dit Laporte. Nous disposons actuellement de plusieurs données relatives à ce comédien et directeur de troupe que nous publierons sous peu dans un article consacré à lui et à Marie Venier, sa femme. C'est pourquoi nous nous contenterons d'insister ici sur le fait qu'il était difficile à vivre, en révolte dès que les affaires ne marchaient pas à son gré et toujours prêt à se débattre vivement. Cet acteur au caractère si peu équilibré

² Voir notre *Vie d'Alexandre Hardy, poète du roi*, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1947, vol. xci, number 4, p. 346.

³ *Documents inédits*, Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, 1927, p. 352.

⁴ *Gaultier Garguille*, 1911.

s'est querelle d'après l'acte notarié du 5 décembre 1610⁵ avec Mathieu de Roger

Qui était ce personnage? Soulié⁶ et Baluffe⁷ nous donnent des renseignements précieux concernant ce protecteur du théâtre français à Paris, car c'est bien là le rôle qu'a joué Mathieu de Roger. Rigal⁸ n'a compris qu'en partie les détails mentionnés par Soulié et il les a mal interprétés. Franssen a déjà attiré l'attention sur ce fait⁹. Les données fournies par Baluffe ont été citées en note par Rigal, mais ce dernier y ajoute "M. Baluffe ne donne pas les preuves de ses assertions, dont quelques-unes, tout au moins, sont fort contestables". Il nous semble que Rigal fait erreur. Baluffe omet en effet de citer ses sources, il y a cependant une nette indication que celles-ci sont authentiques. Ce Moliériste ajoute au nom de Mathieu de Roger le titre de Champluisant, et c'est ce même titre qu'il porte dans les documents trouvés par Soulié. Après le nom de "Champluisant" Baluffe fait suivre entre parenthèses "ou Champlivault ou Champlisant, ad libitem". Cette orthographe fantaisiste des noms que Baluffe n'a pas imaginés, mais qu'il doit avoir rencontrée effectivement, indique clairement qu'il a eu sous la main des documents écrits par des clercs de notaire, ceux-ci se permettaient d'estropier les noms dans presque tous leurs actes, comme ils l'ont fait d'ailleurs dans des dizaines de minutes trouvées par nous. On peut en déduire que les renseignements de Baluffe sont fondés sur des actes dont il faut tenir compte.

En outre—comme nous le démontrons par la suite—les données fournies par Baluffe s'associent si étroitement avec tout ce que l'on peut déduire des documents se rapportant à Mathieu de Roger et publiés par Soulié que, d'après nous, il n'y a aucune raison de douter des communications faites par Baluffe.

Il est naturellement résultat de cette confusion que, dans leurs travaux, les érudits se sont attardés trop peu à Mathieu de Roger, bien qu'il mérite un sort meilleur. Maintenant nous allons lui rendre la place tenue par lui de son vivant.

⁵ Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 20. Voir pièce justificative N° 2.

⁶ Soulié, *Recherches sur Molière*, Paris 1863, pp. 156 et 157.

⁷ *Molière inconnu*, Sa vie, t. I, Paris 1886, p. 319.

⁸ *Le théâtre français avant la période classique*, Paris 1901, p. 63.

⁹ *Doc inédits*, p. 339.

Dans l'année 1614 c'est depuis plus de deux ans que l'Hôtel de Bourgogne est sans représentations des comédiens du roi ¹⁰

Parmi ceux qui ont mis tout en œuvre pour faire renaître le théâtre français à Paris il faut compter Mathieu de Roger, sieur de Champluisant. L'acte notarié susmentionné du 5 décembre 1610 prouve que M. de Roger était déjà à cette époque en étroite relation avec les comédiens du roi. En apprenant que la troupe de François de Vautrel, bannie en 1612 à perpétuité de tout le royaume de France par le Capitoul de Toulouse, puis acquittée du bannissement ¹¹ par Louis XIII en septembre 1613, était de retour en France, de Roger se met aussitôt en contact avec elle et, le 27 juin 1614, il signe un bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne donnant le droit, à François de Vautrel et à ses camarades, de représenter à partir de cette dernière date jusqu'au 30 septembre 1614 ¹². Mathieu de Roger arrive même à obtenir pour cette compagnie des conditions très avantageuses auprès des Confrères. Grâce à sa collaboration le théâtre français à Paris renaît enfin.

La troupe de François de Vautrel n'a pas eu apparemment l'intention de proroger ni de renouveler le bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. Le 30 septembre les portes du théâtre de la rue Mauconseil seront de nouveau closes et personne ne pourra dire pour combien de temps. Mathieu de Roger est d'avis que cette fermeture doit être évitée à tout prix. Il faut que l'Hôtel de Bourgogne reste ouvert et que des comédiens français figurent sur sa scène. Afin de réaliser ceci Mathieu de Roger se met en rapport avec une autre troupe qui vient d'arriver à Paris, la compagnie de Monsieur le Prince sous la direction de Claude Husson, sieur de Longueval. Nicolas Gasteau qui avait suivi fidèlement Valleran le Conte pendant de longues années fait partie de cette troupe à ce moment-là ¹³. Claude Husson veut bien donner pendant quelque temps des représentations à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. Les désirs de Mathieu de Roger ne se bornent pas à cela, il ne veut pas voir les comédiens français installés dans la salle de la rue Mauconseil seulement pour une courte durée, mais ils doivent y exercer leur art au moins

¹⁰ Cf. *La vie théâtrale à Paris de 1612 à 1614*, Modern Language Notes, January 1948.

¹¹ Campardon, *Les comédiens du roi de la troupe française*, Paris 1879, pp. 279 et 280, Lettre de rémission.

¹² Soulié, *Recherches*, p. 156.

¹³ Soulié, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

pendant tout l'hiver jusqu'à Pâques prochain Claude Husson finit par succomber à ses instances et Mathieu de Roger sert une fois de plus d'intermédiaire auprès des Confrères de la Passion. Ceux-ci ne voient pas d'objection à louer leur salle pour sept mois à la troupe de Monsieur le Prince moyennant un loyer de 1400 livres tournois, mais ils exigent une garantie pour cette somme élevée. Mathieu de Roger n'hésite pas à être caution des comédiens. C'est de la sorte qu'il loue l'Hôtel de Bourgogne pour Claude Husson et les siens du premier octobre 1614 au samedi du dimanche de la Passion 1615. Ce bail n'a pas été retrouvé jusqu'à présent et Franssen a omis de le mentionner dans la liste des baux de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne.¹⁴ De la sentence du Châtelet du 2 janvier 1615,¹⁵ publiée par Soulié, nous déduisons néanmoins que ce bail a dû exister. Une autre sentence découverte par Soulié, celle du 16 janvier 1615,¹⁶ donne de plus à entendre que plusieurs comédiens du roi dont François de Vautrel, Hugues Guéru et d'autres se sont associés avec les acteurs de Monsieur le Prince pour la période susmentionnée.

Après sept semaines d'activité de cette troupe à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne des difficultés surgirent, celles-ci furent telles que les représentations cessèrent le 22 novembre 1614. Ce furent sans doute les Confrères de la Passion qui rendirent la vie difficile aux comédiens, en effet ceux-ci n'avaient effectué aucun paiement du loyer. Les Confrères ne manquèrent pas de protester, les sentences du Châtelet du 2 et du 16 janvier 1615, dont nous avons déjà parlé plus haut, condamnent les comédiens à acquitter la somme due, ils persistent dans leur refus et craignant à bon droit que les Confrères ne prennent des mesures sévères contre eux, ils quittent la capitale en toute hâte. Rigal¹⁷ remarque à ce sujet qu'ils laissèrent une dette de 1400 livres tournois, mais ceci est inexact. Le Châtelet a condamné les acteurs au paiement du loyer pour la période allant du premier octobre au 22 novembre 1614 "et ce à raison de 1400 livres, à compter depuis ce jour premier octobre au samedi du dimanche de la Passion ensuivant". Ce qui revient à dire que les comédiens étaient débiteurs de 350 livres tournois environ.

C'est encore à un autre point de vue que Rigal s'est trompé. Il dit "Mathieu de Roger abandonne ses protégés." C'est contraire à la vérité. Les comédiens de Monsieur le Prince qui ont décampé abandonnèrent leur protecteur qui est resté garant pour le

¹⁴ *Doc inédits*, p. 352 seq.

¹⁵ *Op cit*, p. 157.

¹⁶ *Idem*.

¹⁷ *Op cit*, p. 63.

loyer Les conséquences qui en résultent ne se font pas attendre Les confrères exigent que Mathieu de Roger paye. Celui-ci ne pouvant ou ne voulant pas les satisfaire, les Maîtres et Gouverneurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne perdent patience et font appel à la justice Mathieu de Roger est emprisonné pour dettes au Grand Châtelet Baluffe à qui nous empruntons ce détail a soin d'y ajouter "comme Molière."

Mathieu de Roger a donc dû payer cher sa passion du théâtre et son dévouement aux comédiens français Pour autant que nous le sachions il est aussi le seul des différentes personnes ayant pris l'engagement d'être caution des comédiens qui ait eu à subir la peine d'emprisonnement pour son aide désintéressée témoignée aux acteurs.

Quant à la querelle qu'il eut en 1610 avec Mathieu Le Febvre, dit Laporte, celle-ci s'est terminée tout autrement. Le 5 décembre de la même année les deux hommes signent dans l'étude du notaire Cuvillyer un "arrangement à l'amiable, mettant fin aux querelles survenues entre eux" L'accord qui nous le signale est encore intéressant par le côté suivant Baluffe a dit à propos de Mathieu de Roger qu'il a été "directeur ou, du moins, caution d'un directeur de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne." Rigal remarque à ce sujet "Il semble bien à lire l'*Inventaire* que le sieur de Champluisant ne fût pas lui-même comédien"¹⁸ Dans une note allant de pair avec le signalement du bail du 27 juin 1614 Fransen écrit "Le bail ne permet pas à croire avec M. Rigal que M. de Roger fût comédien" Il y a là donc une fois de plus confusion Tout doute concernant la qualité de Mathieu de Roger est levé maintenant En effet, dans notre minute du 5 décembre 1610 Mathieu de Roger est "Bourgeois de Paris" et non pas comédien

L'acte notarié du 19 novembre 1657¹⁹ relate que l'année dernière "des excès sont commis" à l'entrée de la salle de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne par Pierre Jacquinot, cheval-léger de la garde du roi, contre Anthoine Martin, dit La Lande A la date susmentionnée les deux hommes se rendent chez le notaire où Anthoine Martin "quitte Pierre Jacquinot . . de toutes les indemnités auxquelles il pourrait prétendre et il s'engage à ce qu'aucun comédien ne puisse prétendre quelque chose contre ledit Pierre"

¹⁸ *Op cit*, p. 63, note 2

¹⁹ Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 167 Voir pièce justificative No 3

Cette querelle entre deux personnes totalement inconnues met en lumière un fait demeuré inconnu jusqu'à présent. Anthoine Martin, dit La Lande, fait selon la minute fonction de "*receveur des comédiens de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne*" Tallemant des Réaux²⁰ et Couval-Sonnet²¹ ont dit que les chefs de troupe, Valleran le Conte, François de Vautiel et Mathieu Le Febvre, dit Lapoite, recevaient eux-mêmes l'argent à l'entrée de la salle. Plus tard les troupes ont engagé des portiers qui avaient l'habitude de s'approprier une partie de la recette. Pour éviter ce larcin constant on les astreignait parfois à glisser les deniers reçus dans une boîte soigneusement fermée, mais cette précaution même n'arrivait pas à mettre fin à leur propre enrichissement. Or, maintenant nous savons grâce à la dispute entre Anthoine Martin et Pierre Jacquinet que tous ces procédés n'étaient plus en usage et que l'organisation de la troupe et du théâtre a fait un nouveau progrès. Ni les acteurs, ni les portiers n'avaient rien à voir avec la perception du prix des places et l'administration de la recette et des dépenses dans l'année 1657. Les comédiens de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne avaient renoncé à ce travail, ils avaient pris à leur service un receveur dont la responsabilité était engagée.¹

Le rang que tenait ce fonctionnaire dans la troupe est également précisé dans cet acte notarié. Le receveur se charge de veiller à ce qu'aucun des comédiens ne puisse exiger quelque indemnité de Pierre Jacquinet, cela signifie qu'Anthoine Martin n'est pas le subalterne qui ait à se soumettre sans contestation aux ordres des acteurs. Il peut faire sentir son autorité, on écoute sa parole, sa prière, son conseil. Dans la troupe il exerce un certain pouvoir — le poste qu'il occupe a de l'importance.

Mais à un autre point de vue aussi la querelle d'Anthoine Martin et de Pierre Jacquinet a de l'intérêt. Nous savons qu'à l'entrée de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne l'animation ne manquait pas et que la tranquillité dans la rue Mauconseil était fréquemment troublée par des scènes tumultueuses. De la sentence du Châtelet du 3 septembre 1624 renouvelant "les défenses du 4 février 1611 de faire insolences aux portes de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne"²² on peut déduire cet état de choses.

Ces effronteries, qui divertissaient la foule dans l'attente, n'étaient

²⁰ *Histoires*, tome VII, p. 170

²¹ *Les exercices de ce temps*, Satire IX, Le débauché, t. II, p. 102

²² Soulié, *op. cit.*, p. 158

pas l'unique raison du vacarme à l'entrée de la salle. Parmi ceux qui désiraient assister aux représentations, il y en avait qui essayaient de rentrer sans bourse délier et de prendre leur place d'assaut en se servant au besoin de l'épée pour se débarrasser du gêneur Bruscombille s'en est plaint dans un style pittoresque dans son *Prologue contre l'avarice*, Sorel²³ a signalé les fraudeurs, Chapuzeau²⁴ une fois de plus communique pour 1674 que les portiers avaient la charge d'arrêter ceux qui "voudraient passer outre sans billet," et tous les érudits qui ont fait l'étude de la vie théâtrale du dix-septième siècle l'ont répété à leur tour

Il est naturellement impossible de mettre tous ces témoignages en doute. Néanmoins jusqu'à présent nous ne possédions aucun document signalant les délits susmentionnés, les noms des délinquants et les phases successives d'événements semblables. Nous avons toujours dû nous contenter de la constatation pure et simple des infractions aux règlements en vigueur, une pièce authentique de l'époque prouvant qu'un spectateur avait commis des insolences et voulait, en effet, pénétrer dans la salle sans payer faisait défaut

Cette lacune est comblée maintenant. La rixe de 1656 à l'entrée du théâtre de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne a dû naître de quelque effronterie faite par Pierre Jacquinet ou ce qui est plus probable de son refus de payer sa place. Il a voulu forcer l'entrée de la salle et c'est au receveur qui s'est mis au travers de son passage et aux comédiens qui se sont portés au secours de leur fonctionnaire, c'est à eux tous qu'il a fait sentir la force de ses poings et peut-être même le tranchant de son épée

Cette troisième querelle, la dernière de celles que nous venons de traiter et l'acte notarié du 19 novembre 1657 auquel nous avons emprunté ces données ont donc bien une signification toute particulière. Ensemble ils nous apportent la preuve irréfutable de faits auxquels nous avons dû croire en invoquant l'autorité d'auteurs contemporains ou souvent même d'une époque plus ou moins postérieure

Analyse des pièces justificatives

No 1 *Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds XV, liasse 16*
1606, 5 juin

Jehan Rioerocq, cordonnier, tient quitte moyennant une indemnité de 8 livres tournois Valleran le Conte, Estienne de Ruffin, Hugues Guéru, des deux coups d'épées que ceux-ci lui ont données le deux juin rue Montorgueil

²³ *Maison des jeux*, Livre III, p 424

²⁴ *Théâtre français*, p 236.

No 2 *Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 20*
1610, 5 décembre

Affangement à l'amiable entre Mathieu de Roger, bourgeois de Paris,
et Mathieu Le Febvre, sieur de Laporte, demeurant rue Beaupaire, met
tant fin aux querelles survenues entre eux

No 3 *Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 167*
1657, 19 novembre

Anthoine Martin, dit La Lande, receveur des comediens de l'Hôtel de
Bourgogne, rue Montoiguel, quitte Pierre Jacquinot, cheveu-leger de la
garde du roi de toutes les indemnités auxquelles il pourrait pretendre du
fait des exces contre lui commis voici un an par led Pierre, et s'engage à
ce qu'aucun des comediens ne puisse pretendre quelque chose contre led
Pierre

S WILMA DEIERKAUF-HOLSBOER

Meudon, S et O

MIDDLE-ENGLISH POEMS BY MYDWYNTER

I

In *MLN* LIII (1938) 239-245, and *JEGP* xxxix (1940) 230-238, Rossell Hope Robbins advanced the interesting, and attractive, theory that a large part of the anonymous ME religious verse written during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries was the work of members of the Franciscan order. Their purpose was presumably to render clear and memorable to the laity various theological dogmas cherished by their order. This poetic activity was considerably blunted by the Black Death which wrought severe decimation among the Franciscans.

The text of two religious poems which might be fitted into the tradition proposed by Robbins, although possibly composed many decades after the Black Death, is preserved uniquely in British Museum MS Harley 2383, ff. 25^v-30^r. The poems, which lack titles, are attributed therein to a certain Johannes Mydwynter, concerning whose life nothing is known. They treat, in pedestrian fashion, such familiar medieval themes as the joy of heaven, the pains of purgatory, and the seven deadly sins.¹

Harley MS 2383 is a collection of miscellaneous theological tracts

¹ In assigning titles, I follow the suggestions in Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (1943) # 2063, # 2079

in Latin and English Mydwynter's poems constitute item # 25 and are introduced in the *Cat Harl MSS* (v, 2380, 150 ff) as follows *Hunc tractatum, una cum aliis qui sequuntur, collegisse videtur quidam Johannes Mydwynter atque in usum descripsisse cujusdam Simonis Smyht, re Smythe* As to the provenance, Mr T C Skeat of the British Museum writes that the first complete leaf (f 1) bears the date "17 Mar 1715" written in the hand of Humfrey Wanley, Harley's librarian, whose diary shows that "he purchased it from Robert Burscough" "This provenance is confirmed by Bernard *Catalogus Manuscriptorum Angliae* (1697) p 233, # 7649.30, where it figures in Burscough's library The MS measures 9 x 6 in, and is written on paper in a variety of hands of the fifteenth century There is a pencil note on the front fly-leaf 'Sec XV ut auguro vel versus fin XIV,' but this is certainly incorrect, in fact most of the hands, including that of ff 25^v-30^r seem fairly well on in the fifteenth century" Dr C F Buhler of the Morgan Library, who examined the MS on another occasion, writes me that he would date it the "third quarter" of the fifteenth century, and notes that Stafford, Archbishop of Canterbury (1443-1452) discourses on tithes in one of the tracts This dating seems reasonable enough, and is confirmed by the normalized language and late features (e g *th* beside *þ*).

The text of the Mydwynter poems is presumably apograph rather than holograph, at least it is a copy rather than a first draft since there are no alterations or corrections. The pointing, which I have not attempted to reproduce in the diplomatic transcription below, is provided by a linear bracket joining the couplets This is characteristic of many fifteenth century MSS (e.g the verses on the works of mercy in Harley MS 3954, ff. 81^r-82^v). All expansions of abbreviations are indicated by italics.

II

The Joy of Heaven, and how to win it

- 1 Man in heuyn hyt ys mery to dw[e]lle (25^r)
 fyrste the wey *and* seth the roye y woll the telle
 Man loke þat þou be trew *mercyful and* kynde
 The pascioun of cryste *and* þe werkys of *mercy* take wel yn mynde
 5 Man be wel ware of all *maner* dedely syn
 And beþinke þe wel þat thou fall not þere yn
 Loke þat thou loue wel god ful of myzte *and* kepe þe in clen lyyfe
 And loue wel powre men *and* þyn euynerystoun be y þoute eny stryfe

- Kepe wel godes heste whyle *thou* art alyue
 10 And *iewle* þe wel yn all thyng *with* þy wyttes fyue
 Loke þat *thou* haue stydfaste feyth *with* hope *and* *per*fite charite
 As powle yn hys pystyl *and* þe gospell telluþe to þe
 Dedely synnes foisake them alle seuē (26r)
 þus *with* grace *and* mercy of cryste *thou* myzte com to heuen
- 15 þere *thou* schalte a see owre saueowr god kyng ful of myzte
 And alle þat hym hauethe yloued yn trewþe *and* in ryzte
 þere ys more ioie *and* blysse þan eny man can telle
 Well both þukke soules that þere yn mow dwelle
 ffurste þey schul se *with* hure yen bryzte
- 20 Many a fayre blysfulle syzte
 þey schull þere god ful of myzte apertely see
 More ioi þan þat syzte ys may non bee
 To see owre loide owre saueouie owre kyng
 Almyztty god maker of alle þyngē
- 25 ffor as he ys þey schull hym se þan
 soþefaste god *and* soþefaste man
 Thio wye syzte þey schull know
 And se all þyng bothe hy *and* low
 And se all þe weikus that þey eucere wrougte
- 30 And eche mannes dede *and* ech mannes þrouzte
 And alle þe urþe *and* alle þe heuenes abowte
 And alle þyng þat ys beryn *and* beþowte
 Alle þey schulle se þrouze myzte of grace
 Yn þe bryztnesse of goddys face
- 35 Of wych þey schulle euere more haue syzte
 þat makuthe moste ioi in heuen bryzte (26v)
 And fore þey schulle euere þis god beholde
 þey schulle know all þyng þat þey know wolde
 Here men knowþe hym þrouze stydfaste fey *and* grace
- 40 But in heuen men schulle see in hys swete face
 And þat syzte schulle alle men haue
 Withowte ende þat schulle be saue
 No body lyche ye myzte neuere in þis worlde a see
 Apoynte of such bryztnessee as þere schall bee
- 45 ffore þere ys more ioie *and* blysse þan eny man telle may
 þey he leuyd for the begynny[n]g of the worlde into domesday
 Now þenke we in þis ioifulle place
 And amendy we vs *and* axe we mercy *and* grace
 ffor alle myztty god ys more redy to geue mercye
- 50 þan eny man or woman be forto axsye
 ffor þroue þe vertu of cristes pascioun alle men schull be caue
 þat in trew fey *and* hope *and* charite hys mercy wolle craue
 Now praye we to Ihesu owre mercyfulle kyng
 ffor hys mercy *and* hys grace passeth all oþere þyng
- 55 Thus þrouz hys gret mercye *and* hys suete grace
 We mow in heuen see hys suete face

- þat euere ys so fayre *and* bryzte
 þat in heuen zeueth most ioy comfoite *and* lyzte
 We schull alle so see þere apertelye (27r)
 60 Hys blessyd modure seint marye
 þat nexte syttuþe alle myztty gode in heuen bryzte
 Aboue alle angelse *and* þat ys ryzte
 ffor he chesse hure to hys modure dere
 And of hure toke flesche *and* blode here
 65 And fouchedesauē to souke of hure bieste
 þerefore hyt ryzte sche sytte hym nexte
 sche ys so fayre þere sche sytte
 þat hure fayrnesse passeth alle mannes wytte
 And sche prayethe for vs euere mercy *and* grace
 70 þat we mote com in to *that* ioyfulle place
 We schull se þere as þe boke telluthe vs
 Alle þe IX ordeise of angelse
 That both so fayre on to loken
 And so bryzte as telluthe þe boke
 75 þat alle the fayrnesse of þis worlde here
 þat euere was ysey fere on nere
 þat eny man myzte ordeyn more or lasse
 Were note apoynte to þat fayrnesse
 þat we schulle se þere of *that* syzte
 80 Of þe orders of angelse bryzte
 We schulle hem fulle plesant see þane
 And seruabulle to gode *and* to manne
 And eche ordere in hure degre (27v)
 Schull do þe moste lykyng schalle be
 85 But to god *and* to man ryzte
 A grete ioy schall be þere of þat syzte
 ffor eche angele *and* eche seint by hym sylfe alone
 Schalle clerere schyne þan euere sonne schon
 þat syzte men may a grete ioye calle
 90 To se angelse *and* seinttes so bryzte þan alle
 þere ys endeles blysse amonge angelse *and* seintes togedure
 þus ioyfull syztte schall all haue þat schall com þedure
 þey schulle see seinttes hundred þousondes *and* moo
 þat euere worscyppe alle myztty gode *and* praye for vs alsoo
 95 ffor in heuen angels *and* seinttes praye for vs mercy *and* grace
 þat we mote com þedure in to þat ioyfulle place
 þere ys more worscyppe to god of angelse *and* seinttes yfere
 þan euere coupe pope or eny clerke tel in þis worlde here
 þere ys more ioye *and* comfoite of seinttes þan euere knew eny kyng
 100 Sauy owre lorde Ihesu criste þat knowe alle þynge
 þus þere ys more ioye *and* blysse in heuen
 þan eny herte may þynke or tong may nemyn
 Or ere may here or ye may see
 To alle þuk þat schalle ysaued be (28r)

- 105 þus telluth þe gospel pystyl and alle holy wrytte
 As poule in hys pystyl wytnesseth hyt
 In heuen we schulle do non oþere þyng
 But worscyppe alle myzty god heuen kyng
 We schulle be clothede *and þere fede in þat ioifulle place*
- 110 *With bryztnesse and comfirt of alle myzty goddes face*
 In heuen ys more muþe mynstrels and angesles glee
 þan euere was in þis worlde or euere schalle bee
 In heuen euery trewe cristyn men schalle haue more mede
 þan eny man may tell or in eny boke rede
- 115 þus ioi *and blysse ys ordaynede as holy wryzt telluþe me*
 to alle þulke bat loueþe welle gode full of myzte in perlyte fay *and*
charite
 Now forsake we syn *and wykednesse in alle maner þyng*
 And loue we *and worschyppe we welle owre heuen kynge*
 Now alle halowen pray for vs *mercy and grace*
- 120 þat we mot duelle in heuen in þat ioifulle place
 Ihesu owre saueowie for his passion *that he suffred for vs vpon the*
rode tre
 Grante vs for hyr passion *and his grace and his mercy þat hit so be*
 Yworschyppe be alle myzty god owre saueoure þat for vs wold be
 bore
- To sauy vs with his passion þat we schull nozte be ylore
- 125 And alle holy prophetes prophesyde long þere byfoie
 Of Ihesu criste *and of ys rewfulle passion and of ys wondes soie*
 Ihesu seythe to al men haueth þis in mynde (28*)
 Alle þyng þat y suffred hit was to sauy mankynde
 A rewfulle pascoun man y suffred for loue to sauy þe
- 130 fforake thou thy syn now man for loue of me
 Marcy axe *and make þe clene and y forzeue þe*
 Do no more amys but þnyke what y suffred for þe
 Loke man in to my woundes what blode þey haueþe y lete
 Loke man in to my body how sore hit ys ybete
- 135 Loke man dou[n]wards to my fete þat nayled buth to þe rode
 Loke man upwards to my hede þat renneth alle on blode
 Byholde my body with scoigys y suongon
 My fete my hondyn with naylles y stongon
 Loke myn hede y crownede with naylles scharpe
- 140 And with a spei y stonge to þe herte
 iij þowsande *and syx hondrede wondes sore*
 I suffred for þe man and moche more
 þus harde pascioun y suffrede for þe man y wysse
 To byge thy soule to ioie *and heuen blysse*
- 145 þerefor euery man schull haue cristes passion in mynde
 And þenke what Ihesu suffrede for loue of mankynde
 ffor þrouze þe vertu of cristes pascioun we schull haue more mede
 þen euere myzte eny man telle or yn eny boke rede
 Man alle þyng þat criste suffrede here hit was for loue of þe

- 150 *Pere* fore þou art most y hold of alle þyng to loue hym aȝe (29^r)
 Now be we alle louy and kynde
 And haue we welle cristes pascioun in mynde
 Now þonke we ihesu in alle þyng
 Owre saucoure *and* owre heuen kyng
- 155 þat hathe y sauede *and* y schede his blode þere fore
Pere fore worscyppe we hym now *and* euere more
 Euery man schull haue cristes pascioun in mynde
 And þynke what he suffrede to sauē mankynde
 Seint Jerom seyþe alle men by vertu of cristes pascioun schulle besaue
- 160 þat in trew fey and charite his mercy wolle craue
 Take we þus in mynde *and* forsake syn whyl we haue tyme
 And lete we neuere syn bryngē oure soule to pyne
 schryue we vs clene of þouȝte worde and dede
and axe we forȝeue[ne]sse *and* mercy thys ys the beste rede
- 165 Gregory seyþe criste ys more redy to ȝeu mercyē
 Þen eny man or woman be for to axye
 Austen seyþe that criste ys so gracouse *and* mercyfulle kyng
 þat hys grace *and* his mercy passythe alle oþere þyng
 Holy wyȝte telluth *and* alle holy clerkus
- 170 þat ihesu crystes mercy passeth alle hys werkus
 Þenke we hereon and amende we vs whyle we maye
 ffor we schull passy hen[ce] we note neuere what daye (29^r)
 Now ihesu for hys pascioun mercyē *and* grace
 Graunte vs to dwelle in heuen in þat ioyfulle place
- 175 þat hyt so be amen amen for charyte

How to escape the pains of purgatory

- 1 Men þenke hereon ofte tyme
 What helpuþe sowles yn purgatoryes pyne
 Pater noster dirige sauter *and* fastyng
 And almsded *and* masse syngyng
- 5 Þey þe pieste þat synguthe þe masse
 Be neuere so fulle of wrechydnēsse
 The sacrament þat ys so holy
 May not aþeyryde be þroȝe his foly
 Þen may masse sowles owt of pyn bryng
- 10 Þey a synfulle preste hym syng
 ffor in goddesse name he synguþe þe masse
 Vnduse wham in ordere he ysse
 But specialle prayowrs with god entent
 þat buth yseyde be fore and afture þe sacrament
- 15 Of a gode preste byth welle beture
 þan of an euylle *and* welle sueture
 But þe holy sacrament of goddes body
 Helputhe the sowles princepally
 Almsdede helputhe soules meche also (30^r)

- 20 And wel þe more and hyt be in þerfyte charyte ydo
 He þat wyste how meche dinge helpuþ soules in purgatory also
 He wolde sey dirige welle oftme þan he do
 Off alle prayours to helpe sowles owt of pyn to reste
 ffor soþe the holy pater noster vs þe beste
- 25 Pray we for sowles to helpe hem owt of pyn
 We schulle passy hen we not neuere what tym
 Ihesu for hys pascioun mercye and grace
 Graunte vs in heuen bli-se to see hys suete face
 þat hyt so be amen amen pur charyte

Mydwyntin

The Joy of Heaven, etc

- 1 2 seth, adv, afterwards 1 4 MS reads *pascōn* (?), or *pasciōn* (?),
 and so on lines 143, 147, 153, 157, 174
- 1 8 euynerystoun, n, fellow Christians (usually translating Lat *proximi*)
- 1 13 An exhaustive dissertation on the seven deadly sins is that by Marie
 Gothein, "Die Todsunden," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, x (1907)
 416-484 For ME versions, see Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in*
Middle English, pp 350, 352
- 1 16 MS has *lowed* with a line drawn through the first stroke of *w*
- 1 18 buth, pres pl A Southwest Midland form, cf H C Wyld, *A Short*
History of English, § 205 for a handy table of Midland dialect char-
 acteristics A masterly discussion of geographical distribution of dia-
 lects is that of S Moore, H Whitehall, and S R Meech, "Middle
 English Dialect Characteristics and Boundaries," *University of Michi-
 gan Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, XIII
 (1935) 1-60
- 1 21 apertly, adv, clearly, evidently (and in l 59 below)
- 1 44 apoynte, pp, declared
- 1 66 supply *is* after *hyt*
- 1 75 MS has *here* dotted for erasure before *worlde*
- 1 104 þukk = thilk, i e, those
- 1 125 þere, read *yere* (?), i e "many years ago"
- 1 127 Cf Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*, # 51,
 "Christ's Appeal to Man", # 127 "Jesus appeals to man by the
 Wounds" Brown suggests that the theme derives from Caesarius of
 Arles, *De Iudico extremo* (Migne, *Pat Lat*, xxxix, col 2207)
- 1 137 suongon = swongen, v, to beat, afflict
- 1 141 3600 wounds I have been unable to discover any parallel to this
 number The mention of the wounds of Christ is common in medieval
 literature (cf W F Cumming, *The Revelations of Saint Birgitta*,
 EETS OS 178, p xxxviii, quoting from Sloane MS 3548, f 118r) *The*
Cath Encycl, s v wounds, notes a tradition of 5466 wounds inflicted
 on Jesus during the Passion
- 1 144 byge, v, buy, redeem, atone for (as in *P Plowman* B xi, 202)
- 1 151 louy, pres part, i e loving Southern and Kentish forms often
 had this for the -ian infinitive, cf Wyld, § 342
- 1 172 MS reads *nete* (?)

How to escape, etc

- 1 1 The content of this poem may be compared to "Of þe relefyng of saules in purgatory," in BM Additional MS 37, # 049 f 24r, to the *Pricke of Conscience*, ll 2892 ff, to *The Gast of Gy* (Queens College, Oxford, MS 383 version, printed by Bowers in Forster's *Beitrage zur Englischen Philologie*, xxxii, 1938), ll 417 ff, where the Pater Noster, the Ave Maria and the Credo are cited as being most beneficial to be sung for souls in purgatory
- 1 8 apeyryde, v, be impaned, nullified, or weakened
- 1 16 MS reads *and* before *euylle* sueture, n, practitioner
- 1 29 *pur* Evidently the French prep *pour*, although the *NED* affords no authority for, or example of, such an early usage

R H BOWERS

University of Florida

A QUAIN CONCEIT FROM GUARINI TO DRYDEN

The use of the word "die" in sexual signification was not infrequent among English writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries¹ Mr. Cleanth Brooks has recently discussed a probable example of it in Donne's "Canonization"² Many other passages could be cited in which the euphemism is more obvious Shakespeare's Pandarus sings, with his accustomed unambiguous ambiguity

These lovers cry Oh' ho' they die'
 Yet that which seems the wound to kill
 Doth turn Oh' ho' to ha' ha' he'
 So dying love lives still³

Benedict says to his Beatrice "I will live in thy heart, die in thy lap, and be buried in thy eyes."⁴ Donne in "The Dampe" writes

Kill mee as Woman, let me die
 As a mere man,

in "The Prohibition"

Love mee, that I may die the gentler way,

¹ The *NED* does not list the usage

² Cleanth Brooks, *The Well Wrought Urn*, New York, 1947, p 15

³ *Troilus and Cressida*, III, 1, 133-136

⁴ *Much Ado about Nothing*, V, 11, 104-105 Cf also *As You Like It*, IV, 1, 102.

in "Loves Warre"

Here let me warr, in these armes lett mee lye,
Here lett mee parlee, batter, bleade, and dye⁵

Robert Herrick also uses the conceit

I can play, and I can twine
'Bout a Virgin like a Vine
In her lap too I can lye
Melting and in fancie die
And return to life, if she
Claps my cheek, or kisseth me⁶

It would doubtless require some temerity to wish to find the origin and earliest examples of this figure, but we may surmise that it was far more familiar to the readers of Shakespeare and Donne than to the readers of Mr. Brooks, and furthermore that it may have been, like so many images and conceits of the times, an importation from the continent. At any rate, one factor in making it widely familiar to English eyes and ears in the Renaissance was undoubtedly its use in a popular Italian madrigal written by Guarini (and frequently attributed to Tasso)⁷ and set to music by Luca Marenzio and more than a score of other musicians on the continent. It is sometimes entitled "Concorso d'occhi amorosi," and runs as follows

Tirsi morir volea,
Gli occhi mirando di colei ch'adorava,
Quand'ella, che di lui non meno ardea,
Gli disse, oimè, ben mio,
Deh non morir ancora,
Che teco bramo di morir anch'io
Frenò Tirsi il desio
Ch'ebbe di pur sua vita al'or finire,
Ma sentia morte in non poter morire

⁵ *The Poems of John Donne*, ed. Grierson, London, 1929, pp. 14, 57, 60, 101

⁶ *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*, ed. Moorman, Oxford, 1915, p. 17, cf. also pp. 67, 115, 235

⁷ First, it seems, in the Aldine edition of the *Rime del Signor Torquato Tasso*, Parte Prima, Venice, 1581. The madrigal was published by Guarini in his 1598 edition of his own *Rime*. Several manuscript collections of the sixteenth century attribute this piece to Tasso. I owe this information to the kindness of Mr. Luigi Locatelli of Bergamo. This attribution undoubtedly contributed somewhat to the widespread acquaintance with the little poem.

E mentre il guardo pur fiso tenea
 Ne' begli occhi diuini,
 E'l nettar amoroso indi beuea,
 La bella Ninfa sua, che già vicini
 Sentia i messi d'Amore,
 Disse, con occhi languidi, e tremanti,
 Mori, ben mio, ch'io moro
 Ed io, rispose subito il pastore,
 E teco nel morir me discoloro
 Così moriro, i fortunati amanti
 Di morte sì soaue, e sì gradita,
 Che per anco morir tornaro in vita *

This gracefully licentious little poem reached England, then, on wings of song, it pleased, and was promptly translated. It was first printed in English dress in the first part of Nicolas Yonge's *Musica Transalpina*, in 1588 (songs 16, 17, 18). The unknown translator was probably ignorant of the author's identity. His translation is remarkably literal for a version to be sung to the same music, and it manages to preserve a good deal of Guarini's perverse charm.

Thursis to die desired,
 marking her eyes that to his hart was nearest
 And shee that with his flame no lesse was fiered,
 sayd to him Oh halt's loue deerest
 Alas, forbear to die now,
 By thee I lue, by thee I wish to die too
Thursis that heate refrained,
 wherewith to die poore loue then hee hasted,
 Thinking it death while hee his looks maintained,
 full fixed on her eyes, full of pleasure,
 and louely Nectar sweet from them he tasted
 His dantie Nymph, that now at hand espyed
 the haruest of loues treasure,
 Said thus, with eyes all trembling, faint and wasted
 I die now,
 The Shepheard then replied,
 and I sweet life doe die too

* *Rime del Molto Illustrè Signor Cavaliero Battista Guarini*, In Venetia, Presso Gio. Battista Ciotti, MDHC, pp 132^v-133^r. The hendecasyllables of lines 17-18 frequently appear as *settenari*, thus

Cui rispose il pastore
 Ed io, mia vita, moro

See now Alfred Einstein's handsome study of *The Italian Madrigal* (Princeton, 1949), pp 177, 540, for an antecedent (1541) for Guarini's image and for evidence of the tremendous popularity of this madrigal.

Thus these two Loueis fortunately dyed,
 Of death so sweet, so happy, and so desired
 That to die so againe their life retired

The *Musica Transalpina* of 1588 also contains a briefer piece in similar vein (song 42)

Thus they enjoyed the graces,
 Of *Chloris* sweet embraces,
 Yet both their ioyes were scant
 For darke it was, and candle-light they wanted
 Wherewith kinde *Cynthia* in the heauen that shined,
 her nightly vaile resigned,
 and her faire face disclosed
 Then each from others lookes such ioy deriued
 That both with meere delight dyed, and reuiued

The original of this second *morte amorosa*, with which I am not acquainted, may possibly have been the first Italian imitation of Guarini's poem. It had been set to music by Alfonso Ferrabosco. Both English poems are reprinted together, with slight variations, in *England's Helicon*, in 1600 and in 1614.⁹

A less literal, but more perfectly acclimated and smoother English rendering of Guarini's madrigal was composed, perhaps somewhat later, for the music of Walter Porter, and appeared in the latter's *Madrigales and Ayres*, in 1632,¹⁰ without indication of authorship. The nymph here acquires a name.

Young Thyrsis lay in Phyllis' lap
 And gazing on her eye,
 'Steemed life too mean for such good hap,
 And fain the boy would die

When Phyllis, who the force did prove
 Of love as well as he,
 Cried to him Stay awhile, my love,
 And I will die with thee'

So did these happy lovers die,
 But with so little pain,
 That both to life immediately
 Returned to die again

⁹ Whence I copy them. See *England's Helicon*, ed. H. E. Rollins, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935, I, 178, cf. II, 181-182.

¹⁰ The collection, which E. H. Fellowes reproduced in his *English Madrigal Verse 1588-1632* (Oxford, 1920), contains at least several pieces dating from the late sixteenth century. The poem in question is on p. 582 in Fellowes.

Still another brief anonymous song of the period stems from the same source, it was published in John Ward's *First Set of English Madrigals* in 1613

Phyllis the bright, when frankly she desired
Thyrsis, her sweet heart, to have expired,
Sweet, thus fell she a crying,
Die, for I am a dying¹¹

In France, Guarini's poem was no less admired. It figures in two different translations of his madrigals, dated 1623 and 1664. Bense-Dupuis printed the Italian text in his *Apollon* of 1644.¹² Ménage, in his edition of the *Aminta* (1655), refers to "quel vaghissimo Madrigale intitolato *Concorso d'occhi amorosi*, il qual falsamente da alcuni è stato attribuito al Tasso"¹³. Several other French versions or adaptations, some of them in manuscript collections, have been pointed out by Miss Fehier. I shall quote one which appeared in at least three different places in the seventeenth century: in the *Recueil des pièces galantes* (1663), in the *Recueil de quelques pièces nouvelles et galantes* (1664) and in Ménage's *Anti-Baillet* (1688)

Tirsis d'un excès de plaisir,
Estoit sur le point de mourir
Entre les bras de Filis qu'il adore,
Quand Filis, que l'Amour range sous même loy,
Et que le mesme feu devore,
Luy dit, ah' mon Tirsis, ah' ne meurs pas encore,
Je veux mourir avec toy
Tirsis alors suspend l'envie,
Qu'il avoit de perdre la vie,
Mais par cette contrainte il se met aux abois,
Et n'osant pas mourir il se meurt mille fois,
Cependant lors qu'au sein de cette jeune Amante,
Le Berger à longs traits boit l'Amoureux poison,
Elle qui sent déjà qu'il entre en pâmoison,
D'un regard languissant, & d'une voix tremblante,

¹¹ E. H. Fellowes, *English Madrigal Verse*, p. 204. One thinks of Sir Robert Ayton's poem "On Love" which smilingly notes

If all that say they die, had died indeed,
Sur long ere now the world had had an end

¹² See Miss Catherine Fehrer's unpublished dissertation, *The Madrigal in France to the End of the Seventeenth Century* (Bryn Mawr, 1942), of which I have used a microfilm reproduction

¹³ Page 178

Luy dit, mon unique soucy,
 Meurs, mon Tirsis, car ie me meurs aussi
 Soudain ce Berger tout en flâme,
 Luy repond, comme toy ie me meurs, je me pâme
 Ainsi dans les ravissements
 Moururent ces heureux Amans,
 Mais d'une mort si douce & si digne d'envie,
 Que pour mourir encor ils reprirent la vie ¹⁴

Another well-circulated version was that published in the 1664 translation of Guarini's madrigals, with the title "Jouissance"

Tirsis vouloit perdre le iour
 En regardant les yeux de celle qu'il adore,
 Quand elle, dont le cœur, n'auoit pas moins d'amour,
 Luy dit, ah' ne meurs pas encore,
 Puis que nos cœurs viuent sous mesme loy
 Je veux mourir avecque toy
 Tirsis retint le desir qu'il auoit
 De finir lors sa belle vie,
 Mais il souffroit la mort de ce qu'il ne pouuoit
 En mourant assez tost contenter son enuie,
 Et cependant tenoit tousiours ses yeux
 Sur ceux de sa douce ennemie,
 Dont il suçoit le Nectar amoureux
 Sa belle Nymphe enfin qui sentoit les aproches
 Du doux chatouillement qui resout nos humeurs,
 Avec des yeux puissans pour animer des roches,
 Luy dit, mourons Tirsis, ie meurs,
 Et moy, reprit soudain le Berger tout de flâme,
 Dans cette mesme mort avec toy ie me pâme
 Ce fut ainsi que ce couple d'Amans
 Eut vn trépas si plein d'une douceur extreme,
 Que pour mourir encor de mesme,
 Il reuint à la vie apres quelques momens ¹⁵

Meanwhile, of course, numerous reprintings of the Italian text testify to the continued popularity of this madrigal in Italy, where it appeared in editions of Guarini's poetic works, in madrigal col-

¹⁴ Quoted by N B Allen, *The Sources of Dryden's Comedies*, 1935, p 115n from the *Recueil de quelques pièces nouvelles et galantes* (1664) The same version appears, Miss Fehrer informs me, in the La Suze-Pelisson *Recueil*, Trévoux, 1741

¹⁵ *Les Madrigaux du Cavalier Guarini, Auteur du Pastor Fido, traduits d'Italien en vers François Par Monsieur P A Paris, Chez Gvillavme de Lvynes, Libraire Iure, au Palais, sous la montée de la Cour des Aydes M DC LXIV Avec privilège du Roy P 51. Copy at Library of Congress*

lections, and with surprising frequency among the *Rime* of Torquato Tasso

The only important writer to have become interested in this little song seems to have been John Dryden. The editor of several volumes of *Miscellanies* must, of necessity, have encountered our madrigal many times when examining other English or foreign collections of light verse. He was undoubtedly familiar with it in several versions as well as with the original text, it is therefore impossible to determine just which form of the poem he used for the model of his own adaptation, the ultimate source of which has not heretofore been pointed out.¹⁶ Dryden's song was inserted in his comedy, *Marriage A-la-Mode* (printed 1763). Thyrsis and his "daintie nymph," who in England had earlier acquired the name of Phyllis, become now Alexis and Caelia

Whil'st Alexis lay prest
In her Arms he lov'd best,
With his hands round her neck,
And his head on her breast,
He found the fierce pleasure too hasty to stay,
And his soul in the tempest just flying away

When Caelia saw this,
With a sigh, and a kiss,
She cry'd, Oh my dear, I am robb'd of my bliss,
'Tis unkind of your Love, and unfaithfully done,
To leave me behind you, and die all alone

The Youth, though in haste,
And breathing his last,
In pity dy'd slowly, while she dy'd more fast,
Till at length she cry'd, Now, my dear, now let us go,
Now die, my Alexis, and I will die too

Thus intranc'd they did lie,
Till Alexis did try
To recover new breath, that again he might die
Then often they di'd, but the more they did so,
The Nymph di'd more quick, and the Shepherd more slow¹⁷

¹⁶ However, in his study of *The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies*, 1935, p. 115 n., N. B. Allen states that Professor L. I. Bredvold called his attention to the fact that Dryden's song was imitated from the anonymous "French madrigal" which had appeared in 1664 in the *Recueil de quelques piéces nouvelles et galantes*.

¹⁷ *The Songs of John Dryden*, ed. C. L. Day, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1932, pp. 40-42. Day notes that Nicholas Staggins composed the music.

It would be of little interest to trace the fortunes of Guarini's madrigal beyond Dryden's obvious imitation. This is the apogee of its fortune in England, and such fortune is not without honor. For the first time, it loses its English anonymity, henceforth it will be known primarily in Dryden's version,¹⁸ or at least as a typical Restoration or Cavalier lyric. It is only just, at long last, to restore it to its original owner. And it is noteworthy that Guarini's little song, besides playing a considerable rôle in acclimating a celebrated euphemism, far outlived in popularity and prolific power his better-known *Pastor Fido*, and became one of the rare poems of the Cinquecento to relive in a Restoration comedy.¹⁹

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

OLD PROVENÇAL "NOZOL"

"Nozol" occurs in the *Auzels Cassadors* of Daude de Pradas, v. 771, and, if we are to credit E. Rolland,¹ also in the *Flamenca*, v. 2122. Unfortunately, Rolland was in error, since the text of P. Meyer reads

Una chauesc' os unozol

In this situation, however, we have the odd picture of a man's philological instinct being surer than his accuracy in transcription, since, inadvertently, he suggested the correct solution, we should unquestionably read *os (oz) un nozol*. The meaning is suggested by the juxtaposition with *chauesca* (mod. Fr. *chevêche*), i. e. we are apparently dealing with a variety of owl. To be sure the verse of Daude

ab caneta et ab nozol

¹⁸ C. L. Day, *op. cit.*, notes that Dryden's text appeared in several miscellanies from 1672 to 1738, and was immediately imitated in at least one song (by "R. V. Gent" 1672).

¹⁹ A similar fortune befell Ariosto's famous stanza, "La verginella è simile alla rosa" (*Orlando furioso*, I, 42), which also reached England as a madrigal, was several times translated and set to music, and finally became a song in the *Beggar's Opera*. Cf. Alfredo Obertello, "Villanelle e madrigali inediti in Inghilterra," *Italian Studies*, III (1947-1948), 120.

This little study on Guarini's madrigal is a by-product of an investigation of Tasso's influence in England which has been greatly facilitated by grants-in-aid from the University of Oregon and the American Philosophical Society. I am pleased to make grateful acknowledgment here.

¹ *Faune populaire de la France*, Paris, 1877, II, 40 ff.

seems to run counter to this supposition, for *caneta* means 'young duck,' a fact which led one reviewer of my edition² to make the plausible suggestion that we were dealing with water birds. It is now my belief that by the replacement of the base MS^b by MS^v we can remove the seeming disparity between the two cases here cited. The equivalence of the ^v reading *sueta* with *nozol* and the consequent admissibility of the emendation is the subject of this note. If the point is proved, it would not be the only instance of a quasi-hapax common to the unknown author of the romance and the sports-minded canon of Rodez.

There is a wealth of terms for the *strigidae* in the dialects. The Aveyron, Daude's own country, provides *nichoule*, defined by Vayssier³ 'chevêche, espèce de chouette au cri nocturne et plaintif' Maps 694 (Hibou) and 1502 (Chouette) of the *Atlas linguistique*, along with Rolland and the *Trésor* of Mistral, record similar forms *ntsole*, *ntsolo*, *nutsolo*, *nuteyu*, *nuteyulo*, *netola*, *nitola*, *neola*, *neesoula*, *ntsuyule*, *nacholo*, *nachoulo*, *nuechou*.⁴ In this group too, we are to place *nouchoune*, where metaphony and the replacement by the well-known dialectal suffix *-oune* have intervened, also *louchoule*, where assimilation extends to the consonants as well as the vowels, *nouchoulo* (Mistral) shows vowels alone affected.

Evidently Rolland had it in mind that *nozol* was related to this list, since it is included there, although without any demonstration of his reasons. The same statement can be made about the *Supplement-worterbuch* of Levy, who simply adds, under the rubric mentioned "vgl. *nuchol*," without further proof. It is clear that the list presented in the preceding paragraph contains a group of terms all related to the word for 'night-owl' (cf REW 5941) and the popular denomination of these birds as creatures of the darkness has the necessary semantic weight. The etymon is thus a derivative of *nocte* (**noctula* > **noctiola*, etc.), as I now attempt to show.

Firstly, as to vocalism. The variations in the manner of diphthongization in the presence of a palatal are numerous in the Midi. In the accented vowel one encounters, in the modern dialects,

² In *Speculum*, xx (1945), p. 498.

³ *Dict. patois-français de l'Aveyron*, Rodez, 1879.

⁴ No effort is made to show the complicated diacritics of the *Atlas*, which add to printing costs and serve no particular purpose in the present case, unless it be in the barred *ε*, as noted later.

nu, *nue*, *net*, *net*, even *nio*,⁵ alongside of *nuch*, *nueg*, *nuech*, *nueit* in the older language. It is not always essential to have diphthongization, cf. *noit*, *noch* in the older period and a number of variants in the modern dialects (cf. Ronjat, pp. 167-8). Such would be even more the case in unaccented syllable, where reductions occur.

Secondly, as to consonantism. The difficulty seems to be that *-ciy-* > *-ch-* more normally. A glance at the list mentioned above, however, shows a number of forms in *-ls-*. Daude himself uses *nueitz* in the *Auzels*. To-day, the *Atlas linguistique*, Map 929 (Nuit), records *nwels* and *nets*. In Old Provençal one could have *fruchas* vs. *fruitz*, *fruz*, specifically in the *Breviar d'Amor* (Appel, *Chrest*, 115, 157-8) *frugz vertutz*, which can be spelled *vertuz*, the equivalence of *ts*, *tz*, *z* being clearly established.

To return to our passage and its emendation. It has been seen how *nozol* was equated with *chavesca* in the *Flamenca*. In the Daude passage, the variant for *nozol* in MS⁶ is Catalan *mussol*, defined 'Aucell nocturno, tiesso de cos, lo cap trāt en detras, la cara rodona, lo bech revencinat, ulls grossos e rodons, de tant estranya figura que basta pera agafar aucells'. Phonologically, of course, it has nothing to do with the other terms, since the etymon is *mutulus* (Sp. *mochuelo*), but semantically it shows what the scribe thought the word meant, assuming he had a Provençal original before him and that this was *nozol*. The latter, phonologically and semantically, definitely does not belong with *caneta*, but with *sueta* 'chouette'. There is no need of thinking of *sueta* as being influenced in any way by the Catalan coloring of the MS. The FEW (II, p. 549, col. 2) provides an ample number of cases where *s-* and *ch-* alternate in *chouette*. Rolland (II, 39) mentions both *zouetta* and *souetta*. There is no territorial limit for the phenomenon. Furthermore, we may point out that, if the verse is emended to read

ab sueta et ab nozol

there is nothing metrically in the way, since *sueta* (FEW < *ca-vanna*) can be counted as three syllables, just as modern Fr. *chouette* is tri-syllabic in verse.

A. H. SCHUTZ

Ohio State University

⁵ J. Ronjat, *Gr. historique des parlers provençaux modernes*, pp. 175, 167, 176 respectively.

⁶ Labernia, *Dicc de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, 1840.

GEORGES DE SCUDÉRY AND ANTOINE GODEAU

In my *Georges de Scudéry's 'Almahide'* I showed that Scudéry incorporated his *Salomon instruisant le roy* virtually verbatim in *Almahide*, changing the title to *Salomon instruisant Muley Hazen*¹ I also indicated that in this work he used with very little textual change his own earlier works or those of others (Cf *Le Prince déguisé* and Pierre Davity's *Le nouveau theatre du monde*) It now appears that the inspiration, if not the actual direct source, of both of these poems was Antoine Godeau's *L'Institution du Prince* (1644) Scudéry first published his *Salomon* in 1651 and again in 1660-1663 in *Almahide*

Scudéry's approximately 500 verses are written in alexandrines Godeau likewise used 12-syllable verse in 134 quatrains rhyming *abab* Each quatrain has its own individual title Both works are a promulgation of rules for the guidance of the French king with some important variations in topics Godeau as a churchman is more interested in relationship between church and state, while Scudéry the former soldier dwells at some length on the suggested deportment of a king leading his troops in battle.

Scudéry in *Almahide* prefaces his poem with the statement that at the beginning of Muley Hazen's reign a learned Arab composed such a guide for kings, consisting of a "paraphrase" of all that Salomon had said about them Louis XIV had just ascended the throne in 1643²

If Scudéry used Godeau's work as a direct source, he did not copy verbatim as he had done in the case of other borrowings he poured into his novel There is, however, some internal evidence to indicate that Godeau may have been the direct source

For example, Godeau urges Louis XIV to "Respecter, & aimer la Reine sa Mere"

Cette Mere sans pair qui par sa vigilance,
De vostre Auguste Sceptre est la gaide aujourd'huy,

¹ *The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, Vol XXXIV, Baltimore, 1939

² In my monograph (p 103) I showed that Muley Hazen must be a disguise for Louis XIII since Scudéry refers to him as *Le Juste*, an epithet assigned to Louis

Doit en vous, quand les Loix finnoient sa Regence,
 Rencontier à son tour, sa garde, & son appuy
 (Quatrain LVIII)

Scudéry writes

Lors que ton Pere mort abandonna la Terre,
 Il te laissa fort ieune, & ton Royaume en guerre
 Ta Mere la soustint avec beaucoup d'eclat
 Et prenant hardiment le Tymon de l'Estat,
 Prenant tes interets, espousant tes queielles,
 Ton Berceau fut couuert de Palmes immortelles,
 Imite moy, Muley, par ta reconnoissance
 Que ne luy dois tu point, luy deuant la naissance?
 Aime la donc, mon Fils, elle est Mere, elle est Reyne,
 Sa Regence fut longue, & ne fut pas sans peine,
 (*Almahide*, VIII, 549-550)

Both writers warn that the sovereign will be held accountable by his subjects for his minister's actions, and on the subject of favorites Godeau states

Aimez, mais en aimant, faites nous reconnaistre,
 Que la seule raison preside à vostre choix,
 Prenant vn Fauory, ne prenez pas vn Maistre,
 Et sçachez que l'Estat, ne peut souffrir deux Roys
 (Quatrain LXII)

The above lines may be compared with what Scudéry says about ministers

Aime le, chers-le, prens plaisir à le voir,
 Mais n'en fais pas ton Maistre, en cedant ton pouuoir,
 Qu'il soit au pied du Thrône, & non pas à ta place,
 (*Almahide*, VIII, 554)

Godeau has the following to say about the grandeur of God and His supreme power over kings

Les Roys ne sont pour nous que force & que lumiere,
 L'éclair est dans leurs yeux, la foudre est dans leurs mains,
 Mais n'en fais pas ton Maistre, en cedant ton pouuoir
 Et la Mort les égale au reste des humains (Quatrain V)

And Scudéry

Les Roys portent vn Sceptre, & Dieu porte la Foudre
 Thrône, Sceptre, Couronne, & Roy, tout n'est que poudre
 Vn seul de ses regards, les dissipe en passant,
 Comme l'ombre au matin l'est du Soleil naissant
 (*Almahide*, VIII, 548)

Both poets urge that the king bend every effort to save the peace he should commit his nation to war only after all means to avoid

conflict have been exhausted. Likewise, both writers vigorously attack blasphemy

Another textual parallel worthy of note is to be found in the instructions concerning keeping one's promises

Ne donnez point d'espoir qui se trouue friuole,
Soyez ferme & fidelle apres auoir promis,
Et sçachez que la loy de garder sa parole,
Sans dispense, s'étend jusques aux ennemis

(Quatrain CVIII)

Pour te couurir d'honneur, obserue tes parolles
Qu'elles soient en tout temps plus fermes que les Poles
Vn Prince doit tenir tout ce qu'il a promis,
Sans mesme distinguer l'Amy des Ennemis

(*Almahide*, VIII, 569-570)

Several other textual comparisons could be offered to show similarities in ideas or in actual phrasing. In some instances, Scudéry appears to have borrowed Godeau's quatrain titles as a starting point for further paraphrasing. "Le Prince doit agir de luy-mesme" (LXVI) and "Escoute ses (the minister's) conseils, mais agis par toy mesme" (*Almahide*, VIII, 555), "Il doit chasser les Flatteurs" (Quatrain C) and "Chasse-les, chasse-les" (*Almahide*, VIII, 569), "Il doit abhoïrer le mensonge" (Quatrain CIX) and "Deteste le menteur, & ne le sois iamais." (*Almahide*, VIII, 572), "Soyez sobre à la table" (Quatrain CXVII) in the text of the verse may be compared with "Sois sobre en tes repas" (*Almahide*, VIII, 579). Both poets urge the king to be gay rather than melancholy, and both admonish him to control his anger when judging subjects lest his ire cause him to commit an unintentional injustice. (Quatrain CXXX and *Almahide*, VIII, 577, Quatrain XLVII and *Almahide*, VIII, 566, respectively.)

The foregoing parallels then show that Godeau and Scudéry were at least thinking along the same lines if the latter did not actually "paraphrase" Godeau. That Godeau and the Scudéry's were on friendly terms as late as September 8, 1650, and that Madeleine at least was reading Godeau's verses are shown in a letter the sister addressed to Godeau.³

JEROME W SCHWEITZER

The University of Alabama

³ Quoted by Rathery et Boutron in their *Mademoiselle de Scudéry*, Paris, 1873, p. 217

RICHELET, FORERUNNER OF SAMUEL JOHNSON,
AND DE LORMES

The first author of a dictionary to express extensively his personal likes and dislikes while illustrating the use of words was not Samuel Johnson, but Pierre Richelet, whose habit of belittling or extolling certain individuals is pronounced enough to color his entire work.¹ A good example of his method is supplied by the case of Thomas de Lormes, who is assailed on forty-six different occasions.² There is a poem in the tradition of the Roman epigram to illustrate the use of *achevé*

Ce que Delorme fait, ce malheureux Rimeur,
Montre que sa bizarre Humeur
Est une folie achevée

The other allusions are in prose and point out that Thomas de Lormes is inept in the art of poetry and the profession of law. He is a lawyer of lost cases who tries in vain to scale the heights of Parnassus (*s'acrédiéter*). He remains unblessed by Apollo (*Apol-lon*), who is thoroughly disgusted with his antics (*amiver*). His reputation is nil (*afugeant*), but he compensates for the cruel indifference of the public towards his works by indulging in self-praise (*s'admirer*). Although all announcements containing his name are immediately destroyed (*affiche*), he continues to expose himself to satirical thrusts by insisting on publishing (*admonêter*). His greatest adversary is good sense (*adversaire*). He has no equal in abusing the French language (*afectionner*). He speaks like an

¹ The total number of remarks is nearly 1200. Richelet mentions about 500 individuals only once, and slightly fewer than 100 are spoken of twice. Those to whom 3 allusions are made number 50, whereas those included 4 times are only about 25. Approximately 70 personages are spoken of 5 or more times. There are 11 allusions to Port Royal, 12 to Jansenius and Jansenism, and 19 to the French Academy. The remarks about people mentioned 5 times or more number 850. There is not an equal number of instances of personal allusion and of remarks since many of the latter contain references to two or more individuals. There are about 1600 allusions in the 1200 remarks.

² Curiously enough no mention is made of him in the first edition of 1679-80. He is included for the first time in the revised and expanded edition of Cologne, Jean François Gaillard, 1694, and the posthumous editions of Rouen, Le Boucher, 1719, and Paris, Barbou, 1730.

Allobrogian and thinks like an Ostrogoth (*Allobroge*) An examination of his poetry will reveal neither common sense nor French (*anatomiser, animal, aspiration*) Only a part of his strange ways would fill a notebook (*agenda*) His sanity has apparently been disturbed by his efforts in poetry (*alambiquer, armet*) for his imagination is filled with chimeras (*aler*) If the occupational hazard of poets is poverty, Thomas has nothing to fear in that direction (*âge*) in spite of the fact that his lot is no better than that of the hod carrier (*aide à maçon*) Good name and fame will never be his (*s'agrandir*) His works are easily obtained since no one will purchase them from the shops (*assement*) It must be that he writes his poetry for penance (*ami*) and to provide wrapping paper for the grocers (*à moins que de, vers*) The *beurrères de Lyon* have obtained cheap wrapping for their wares by purchasing his works and the publisher is quite satisfied with the transaction (*s'apprécier, beurrère, rame*) He is decried even in Grenoble, his home (*ânerie*) A splendid play has just been announced *Thomas de Lormes ou Marsyas écorché par les Muses* (*anoncer*). His method of writing is obscure (*amphibologie*) He is truly apocryphal (*apocriphe*), a fool and a rogue (*archifou, ficasser*) He is a great stylist (*arrondisseur*), who has his own manner of writing (*aucunement*) that would inspire attack by Boileau (*s'applaudir*) There is no one in the kingdom who deserves to be more thoroughly denounced (*autant, camouflet*) For Richelet, he is a *cancre* (*vidé*) He is as boring as Lazare Baif (sic) (*Lazare, tédieux*) He has had his works bound "en veau, et il se fait moquer de lui car c'est un franc veau" (*veau*) In short, "Si l'on voulait définir T. L. on dirait que c'est un animal qui boit et mange, fourbe les dames quand il peut, et fait toujours de méchants vers et de méchante prose, où le bon sens trébuche à chaque page" (*définir*)

The problem of the identity of the much belabored Thomas de Lormes is not new Richelet's contemporaries sought for information and were rewarded with this answer by Richelet in his *Les Plus Belles Lettres*, fifth edition, pp 525-6.³

A Monsieur Thomas De Lormes,
Avocat au Parlement de Grenoble

On répond par de bons offices à ses injures

J'ai, à la faveur de mes petits Ouvrages, tâché de faire connoître ce que

³ Cf also Frédéric Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils Collectifs de*

vous valez, & par bonheur j'en suis venu a bout Les gens de Lettres de Province commencent à s'entretenir de votre mérite, & ceux que j'ai l'honneur de voir à Paris, me demandent tous, qui est ce *Monsieur Thomas de Lormes*, dont vous parlez si avantageusement? Ho, ho! leur dis-je d'un air qui témoigne l'estime que j'ai pour vous, c'est un grand Poete, & un grand Orateur, le Malherbe du Dauphiné, & le Patru du Parlement de Grenoble & pour en être agréablement persuadé, vous n'avez qu'à lire ses Œuvres C'est, Monsieur, de la manière que je satisfais la curiosité des Personnes Illustres qui veulent avoir plus de connoissance de ce que vous valez, & vous me devriez sçavoir quelque gré d'une conduite si obligeante Mais au contraire, vous jetez feu & flâme, & vous me déchirez par de si misérables satires, que si l'on ne voyoit votre nom au bas, on penseroit qu'elles fussent de ces barbouilleurs, qui depuis la Serre, ont été en France Hé! Monsieur, ne détruisez point par de méchantes pièces la réputation ou vous êtes C'est un bien fragile que cette réputation, & elle vous doit être d'autant plus chère, qu'elle vous coûte infiniment Travaillez, je vous en conjure, avec esprit, ou demeurez en repos, & faites moi la grace de croire que rien ne m'empêchera de continuer avec ardeur à vous faire voir que je suis de toute mon âme,

Votre très-humble
Serviteur, R

SPIRE PITOU

Marquette University

A NOTE ON DIDEROT AND PATRIOTISM

Not long ago the distinguished scholar, R. R. Palmer,¹ devoted a considerable effort to overthrowing the established idea that the men of the eighteenth century were unpatriotic cosmopolitans. Such correctives to traditional generalizations are salutary, provided they do not fall into the opposite error out of a spirit of contradiction. This the author tries not to do, and with scholarly honesty admits there was perhaps less real nationalism, than a growth of civic consciousness.² He then tries to rescue the import of his findings by pointing out that this type of "nationalism" readily turns into the other (i. e. exclusive) kind.

Poésies, III (1662-1700), Paris, Leclerc, 1904, pp. 505-506 for Richelet's epigrammatic poetry directed at Thomas de Lormes.

¹ "The National Idea in France before the Revolution," *JHI*, I (1940), 95-111.

² Actually, Pierre Hermand had already pointed this out, in his *Idées morales de Diderot*, Paris, 1923, p. 175.

Palmer ignores the mountain of conflicting evidence, feeling perhaps that he is not called upon to prove the opposite of his thesis. And yet the contrary evidence shows that the "civic consciousness" type of patriotism may not only grow into the modern feeling of nationalism (a conclusion it contains only implicitly), actually, it reveals quite explicitly that "civic consciousness" is equally consistent with anti-nationalism. The co-existence of these two sentiments is clearly seen in Diderot. While a study from the viewpoint of the history of ideas is of value in making us know what people thought, it is also interesting to know how they felt.³ In Diderot's writings we have not only a reasoned theory of patriotism, but also his own intimate feelings.

From the purely intellectual viewpoint, patriotism for Diderot was a truly civic concept, and an integral part of his system of ethics. It was one phase of humanitarianism,⁴ it was one aspect of his idea of virtue as a selfishly intelligent sacrifice of particular interest for the general interest.⁵ Nowhere was this clearer than in his support of compulsory inoculation.⁶ Patriotism is what the legislator must at all costs implant and nourish: "le législateur doit se proposer de changer l'esprit de propriété en esprit de communauté . . . tous marchent ensemble et contents vers le bien commun, l'amour de la patrie . . . élève l'âme au-dessus des petits intérêts . . ."⁷ But in the same article, Diderot also writes: "Tous les peuples ont aujourd'hui des idées assez justes de leurs voisins, et par conséquent ils ont moins que dans les temps d'ignorance l'enthousiasme de la patrie."⁸ He has but a poor opinion of those "têtes étroites" who think primarily of the interest of their own country rather than of humanity as a whole. "Ces hommes veulent

³ For a general study of nationalism in the 18th c., see Hans Kohn *The Idea of Nationalism*, N. Y., 1944, ch. v, also L. Ducros *Les Encyclopédistes*, Paris, 1900. Of some value, Aubertin *L'Esprit public au 18e siècle*, Paris, 1889, G. Maugras *Trois mois à la cour de Frédéric II*, Paris, 1886, p. 3-4. Kohn, incidentally, contrary to Palmer, asserts that Rousseau was not a nationalist (p. 245).

⁴ Lanson "Les Origines de l'esprit philosophique," *ROC*, xvii², 1901, p. 556.

⁵ Cf. *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, éd. Babelon, Paris, 1930, II, 309.

⁶ *Mémoire sur le calcul des probabilités*, *Œuvres*, éd. Assezat et Tourneux, Paris, 1875, ix, 207-212.

⁷ "Législateur," *Œuvres*, xv, 421-2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 434.

qu'on les appelle bons citoyens, et j'y consens, pourvu qu'ils me permettent de les appeler méchants hommes"⁹

It is quite clear that in Diderot's mind, the idea of patriotism not only is not associated with that of nationalism, but excludes it. The opposition is definite between "amour de la patrie" and "enthousiasme de la patrie." The latter he brands as an irrational impulse, stemming from passion, not knowledge. Love your country, yes, but as a family of men working together, part of a still larger family. This was very far from the abstract, semi-mystical concept of State or Nation that sprung from Revolution and Romanticism and demanded a man's exclusive loyalty. Here was a higher loyalty.

The "esprit de communauté," in Diderot's concept, is a matter of intelligent persuasion as much as—if not more than—an emotion. The key to patriotism, in the modern sense of nationalism, lies in *feeling*—an irrational, and in its vilest form, an anti-rational feeling. An examination of Diderot's writings, and especially of his correspondence, reveals that Diderot felt no real patriotism. The humiliating succession of French defeats made no impression on him and aroused no animosity toward the English.¹⁰ His feelings towards his country—on those rare occasions when country, as such, entered his mind—were determined by his personal prejudices and experiences, especially the trials he had endured with the publication of the *Encyclopédie*.¹¹ France had persecuted him, and Russia had offered a helping hand. Which were the barbarians? When the Russian government flirted with the idea of sponsoring a new encyclopedia, Diderot embraced the suggestion enthusiastically, savoring the prospect of avenging himself on his country for his

⁹ Diderot emphasized this again in a letter to Hume (22 fev 1768).

"Et que m'importe qu'un homme soit né en deça ou au-delà d'un étroit?

Vous servirez votre espèce en général, ce qui est bien plus digne de vous que de n'en servir qu'une bien petite portion" (L. Cru *Diderot as a Disciple of English Thought*, N. Y., 1913, pp. 467-8). Also (*ibid.*, pp. 466-7) "Ne verrons-nous jamais finir ces aversions nationales . . ? Je me flatte d'être, comme vous, citoyen de la grande ville du monde." A specific application of this belief came when Diderot condemned critics who attacked the *Encyclopédie* for revealing secrets of the national economy (*Œuvres*, xiv, 492-3).

¹⁰ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, éd. Babelon, I, 297, II, 297.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, II, 191 (3 octobre 1762).

torments¹² And later, Catherine, in a very material way, was good to him, consequently he rejoiced with her when she trounced the Turks—"je m'en réjouis comme homme, comme philosophe et comme Russe, car je le suis devenu par l'ingratitude de mon pays et par vos bontés"¹³ Was this just rhetoric? Not entirely The Russians, when he visited them, had paid homage to his worth and inflated his ego He had no such recognition in his own country There is no doubting his sincerity when he writes to Sophie Volland, "Je suis forcé d'avouer à moi-même que j'avais l'âme d'un esclave dans le pays qu'on appelle des hommes libres, et que je me suis trouvé l'âme d'un homme libre dans le pays qu'on appelle des esclaves"¹⁴ Was there also in Diderot's mind the thought of the many manuscripts locked in his desk, the very flower of his genius, that he dared not publish while he lived in his own country?

The only instance of nationalistic feeling I have discovered in Diderot's writings was also the result of a moment of pique (possibly personal) against an English art critic, Daniel Webb, who had the impertinence to ignore French critics and artists in his *Inquiry into the Beauties of Painting*¹⁵ This isolated outburst has its interest, it shows that any man is capable of nationalism, in the right environment, under pressure well directed towards his ego, even a man who so resolutely opposed it

But our essential conclusion is not altered. Patriotism, in the partisan sense of devotion to the interests of one's country above those of any other country, was unknown to Diderot It was a kind of loyalty foreign to his generous emotions and his human

¹² "Je ne vous dissimulerai pas qu'il m'est doux de penser que ces barbares qui s'appellent policés par excellence grinceront les dents et qu'il ne leur restera que la honte de leurs anciennes persecutions" (Lettre à Betzky, 15 juin 1774, *Œuvres*, xx, 64) Was it his country he was thinking of, or the hated government of his country? It is probable that the confusion between the two ideas was one of the elements that prevented a growth of nationalism

¹³ Letter to Catherine the Great, Sept 13, 1774, in Grot *Sept lettres à Catherine II*, p 514

¹⁴ Babelon *op cit*, III, 256 (15 juin 1774)

¹⁵ London, 1760 Diderot continues "Je ne pardonne pas davantage à Hogarth d'avoir dit que l'Ecole française n'avait pas même un mediocre coloriste Vous en avez menti, monsieur Hogarth, c'est de votre part, ignorance ou platitude Je sais bien que votre nation a le tic de dédaigner un auteur impartial, qui ose parler de nous avec éloge" (*Salon de 1765*, *Œuvres*, x, 303)

philosophy He despised it, and confidently predicted its disappearance from the earth ¹⁶

Of Diderot it can be said, as Galiani wrote of d'Alembert, "Fa moderata stima della sua nazione" ¹⁷ He did not have d'Alembert's objectivity, but his prejudices were personal and not mystical Like his *confrères*, Diderot was a true patriot, one who believed in the duty to conform to the common good, but one who refused to abdicate the autonomy of his reason We find the same attitude almost everywhere among French thinkers in the 18th century Condorcet—whose philosophy was a quintessence of the most general currents of thought—made a distinction between "amour de la patrie" and "enthousiasme" that was similar to Diderot's ¹⁸

We, too, must make a distinction The men of the 18th century were not unpatriotic, they were anti-patriots

LESTER G CROCKER

Sweet Briar College

¹⁶ Cf *Œuvres*, xv, 434-5 "On ne pourrait aujourd'hui, par des artifices politiques, inspirer des haines nationales aussi vives qu'autrefois les peuples trouveront si peu de raison de se préférer à d'autres que, s'ils conservent pour la patrie cet amour qui est le fruit de l'intérêt personnel, ils n'auront plus du moins cet enthousiasme qui est le fruit d'une estime exclusive" This was to result from the interdependence of all nations, their union in a large family, working together

¹⁷ Fausto Nicolini *Lettre médite*, *RLC*, x (1930), 748

¹⁸ "Parmi ces erreurs particulières que l'on suppose être utiles dans chaque nation, quelques auteurs ont placé l'amour de la patrie, les uns pour rendre plus favorable la cause de l'erreur en confondant avec des erreurs un sentiment naturel, nécessaire au maintien de la société, les autres, parce qu'ils ont confondu avec le véritable amour de la patrie, l'orgueil national L'amour de la patrie est donc un sentiment naturel inspiré à la fois par les deux seules causes morales qui agissent sur nous notre intérêt et notre bienveillance pour les autres Ce sentiment n'est pas contraire à celui de la bienveillance universelle Marc-Aurèle disait "Je préfère ma famille à moi-même, ma patrie à ma famille, et l'univers à ma patrie" L'amour de la patrie, inspiré par ces motifs naturels, est susceptible du même enthousiasme que nos autres sentiments, enthousiasme momentané et aveugle dans la plupart des hommes, mais éclairé et durable dans les grandes âmes" *Œuvres*, éd Arago-O'Connor, Paris, 1847-49, v, 370-2

JOHN DONNE AND THE TOWER OF BABEL

For the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, one of the more fascinating legends in the Old Testament was that of the building of the tower of Babel and the consequent confusion of tongues. On the basis of the latter event, philologists worked out a series of language relationships that adumbrated the more scientific findings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and ethnologists, accepting the Dispersion as an established fact, propounded migratory theories that were subsequently substantiated in part. But the mere idea that historical man, like the Titans of old, had once attempted to storm the palace of God filled men of imagination with inextinguishable wonder and set them to searching for enlightening material in all the archives of antiquity.

The most captivating realization of this aspect of human curiosity is Pieter Breugel the Elder's amazing "Building of Babel," but men of letters were also stirred by the Biblical account and the subsidiary literature about it. In England the references are many. We read in the *Conflict of Conscience* a traditional reason for the erection of the tower,¹ and George Peele gives us another in the *Battle of Alcazar*.² Greene³ uses the height of the tower as a metaphorical contrast, and Spenser's House of Alma, we recall, is made "of thing like to that Ægyptian slime, / Whereof king *Nine* whilome built Babell towre"⁴. Sir Thomas Browne gathers up all the pertinent material in the *Religio Medici*⁵ and the *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*,⁶ and everyone remembers that Milton's best discussion of this event is found in the twelfth book of *Paradise Lost*.

Most of the literary allusions can be immediately glossed by anyone familiar with the literature, but John Donne, as usual, has a passage that causes some trouble. In the *Second Anniversary*, he writes:

¹ Dodsley, *Old English Plays* (London, 1874), vi, 36

² *Works* (Bullen, London, 1884), i, 238

³ *Frier Bacon and Frier Bungay*, II, 1, 34

⁴ *F Q*, II, ix, 21, 6

⁵ *Works* (Keynes, London, 1928), i, 31, 85

⁶ III, 153, 215, 275-6

They who did labour Babels tower to 'erect,
 Might have considered, that for that effect,
 All this whole solid Earth could not allow
 Nor furnish forth materialls enow,
 And that this Center, to raise such a place,
 Was far too little, to have been the Base (417 22)

With his customary considerate afterthought, he provides us with a short commentary in his Nativity Sermon of 1624 "Onely he can raise a Tower, whose top shall reach to Heaven The Basis of the highest building is but the Earth"⁷ So we have two objections to Nimrod's project there is not enough matter in the world for such a tower and the earth is too small for the required foundation. Both of these objections seem to have been original in some degree with Donne

The notion that the tower would have to be of immense height—four miles says the traditional Isidore,⁸ much higher says the extra-traditional Eutychius⁹—go back to the account of Josephus¹⁰ But as early as Philo¹¹ and Cyillus of Alexandria,¹² men doubted whether it could have been possible to complete the tower even if "the gods" had not decided to descend Sixteenth and seventeenth century commentators, while offering new heights like nine or twenty-seven miles, emphasize, without being specific, the foolishness of the plan To some of them the idea is so absurd that they accept the story only as allegory¹³ Calvin, however, comes at Donne's first objection rather directly "Isti (the Babel Builders) autem quum lapidibus et caemento careant, non tamen dubitant aedificum aggredi quod nubes transcendat."¹⁴ Pererius, the eminent Jesuit, touches the second objection though not in the same way

⁷ *Sermons* (London, 1640), LXXX, 14

⁸ *Chronicon*, PL, LXXXII, 1022-3

⁹ *Annales*, PG, CXI, 919

¹⁰ *History*, I, 4, 23

¹¹ *De Confusione Linguarum*, xxx, 156

¹² Existimarunt enim, nescio quo pacto, se ex lateribus et luto turrum, quae ad coelos usque pertingeret aedificare omnino posse PG, LXIX, 77

¹³ Paulus ab Eitzen, *Commentarius in Genesim* (Frankfurt, 1560), p 309; J Mercer, *In Genesim Commentarius* (S 1, 1598), p 227, G Musculus, *In Genesim Commentarius* (Basileae, 1600), p 260, Polycarp Lyser, *Noachus* (Lipsiae, 1605), p 413, A Tostatus, *Commentaria in Genesim* (Venetia, 1727), I, 162

¹⁴ *Commentarius in Genesim, Opera* (Brunsvigae, 1882), XXIII, 164

Neque enim turris illa usque ad altitudinem quatuor milliarum, adiuncta congruenti crassitudine, & amplitudine eius simulque profunditate fundamentorum, quo scilicet tantae molis pondus sustineretur, ulla hominum opera aut fabricari, aut fabricata tandiu consistere, ac perdurare potuisset¹⁵

Though both of these objections are similar to Donne's, they are not Donne's objections. Were his ideas original, suggested, perhaps, by previous objections? A survey of available material suggests that they were. It is, consequently, interesting to find objections similar to Donne's in the highly original *Turris Babel* (1679) of Athanasius Kircher. This great Catholic polymath calculates that the tower would have to be 178,672 miles high to reach the moon and that its height at that point would be the radius of the earth multiplied by fifty-two. Its mass, then, would be greater than the mass of the earth. So he doubts whether the tower could have been completed because 1. There would not be sufficient material in the world to build it, 2. Once the tower got beyond the center of gravity, it would collapse, 3. If it were built at the rate of a mile a week, it would take 3426 years to get it as high as the moon, 4. When it got that high, it would take a draught horse that climbed thirty miles a day more than sixteen years to take a load from the base to the summit.¹⁶

DON CAMERON ALLEN

DIE MUTTER IN ADALBERT STIFTERS WERKEN

"Ich hatte mich daran gewohnt, die Mutter als das Bild der größten häuslichen Reinheit zu betrachten, als das Bild des Duldens, der Sanftmut, des Ordens und des Bestehens,"¹ so spricht der Freiherr von Risch von seiner Mutter im *Nachsommer*. Und ein paar Zeilen weiter:

¹⁵ *Commentariorum et disputationum in Genesim libri IV* (Lugduni, 1607), II, 489.

¹⁶ *Opus cit.* (Amstelodami, 1679), pp. 37-40. John Milton will subsequently base his doubts on the possibility of erecting the tower on a more orthodox basis: "Wretched man! what food / Will he convey up thither to sustain / Himself and his rash Armie, where thin Aire / Above the Clouds will pine his entrails gross, / And furnish him of Breath, if not of Bread?"

¹ A. Stiffters *gesammelte Werke* Leipzig, Insel Verlag, 3, 667.

Sie, die nie gefordert hatte, die nie auf sich irgend eine Beziehung gemacht hatte, die gerauschlos immer gegeben hatte, die jedes Schicksal als eine Fügung des Himmels empfangen hatte und die in ruhigem Glauben ihre Kinder der Zukunft anvertraut hatte²

Man kann noch hinzufügen, daß diese Mutter nicht mehr jung ist, daß sie noch die Spuren einer großen Schönheit aufweist, und daß sie keine ungewöhnliche Bildung genossen hat. Damit haben wir den Typus Frau vor uns, die den Helden Stifters zwar das Leben schenkt, aber sie sonst nicht aktiv bildet und beeinflusst. Daß ihre Existenz und ihr Wesen zum Charakter ihrer Kinder beitragen, ist nicht zu bestreiten. Doch hebt der Dichter diesen Einfluß selten hervor. Und doch muß seine eigne Mutter direkte Einwirkung auf Stifters Werden gehabt haben, denn er charakterisiert sie in seinen Briefen als "von meist dichterischem Gefühle" (an Dr. H. Meynert, 16. 11. 1848)³ und als "einen unergrundlichen See von Liebe" der den "Sonnenschein ihres Herzens über manchen Teil meiner Schriften geworfen" (an seine Nichte Luise 21. 4. 1855)⁴. Einfach und wenig gebildet war auch sie, und doch erscheint sie uns realer und tatkräftiger als die Mutter seiner Erzählungen.

Stifters Mutter muß auch etwas Herbes an sich gehabt haben, wie wir aus seinen Jugenderinnerungen heraushören. Dagegen sind die Mutter seiner Werke fast stets süße altliche Frauen, denen die Gatten nachruhmen, daß sie immer treu, gutig und anpassungsfähig waren.

Wenn man nun bedenkt, daß alle anderen Charaktere Stifters, männliche sowie weibliche, ein starkes Eigenleben führen, obwohl sie manchmal bis aufs Äußerste stilisiert sind und zu den Trägern von Ideen werden, so wundert man sich, warum er die Mutter geradezu vernachlässigt hat.

Wie anders hat Keller die Mutter dargestellt! Frau Regula Amrain, des grünen Heinrichs Mutter und die anderen, wie kraftig, wie wirklich und selbständig stehen sie da! — Es ist ja nicht so, daß Stifter alle Frauen unterordnet. Im Gegenteil: Brigitta, Corona, die ältere Gerlint sind Kerngestalten, die den Männern zum mindesten die Wage halten. Und die Mädchen, ob gebildet oder einfach, beweisen Geistes- und Seelenstärke, Freiheit und Tatkraft,

² *Ibid.*, 667

³ Josef Bindtner, *Adalbert Stifter, sein Leben und sein Werk*, Leipzig 1928, 20

⁴ *Ibid.*, 20

die fast an die emanzipierten-Frauen der Jung-Deutschlandepoche heranreichen. Dies gilt auch von den Grossmüttern, welche die Trägerinnen des Dichterischen darstellen, mit dem sie ihre Enkel oft so heftig beeinflussen (*Hardedorf, Waldbrunnen*). Sogar die Pflegemutter ist ein Individuum, dessen Eigenart dem Leser klargemacht wird, wie im *Hagestolz*.

Einige bedeutende Frauen sind ebenfalls Mutter, so Brigitta und Mathilde (*Nachsommer*). Aber ihre Mutterschaft ist unwichtig ihrer allgemeinen Menschlichkeit gegenüber. Die Erziehung ihrer Kinder wird von Männern geleitet. Manche Mutter wäre wohl eine tatige Erzieherin geworden, hatte sie länger gelebt. Aber Margaritas Mutter, in der *Mappe meines Urgrossvaters*, stirbt, als das Kind erst drei Jahre alt ist.

Doch es gibt Ausnahmen. Die Mutter der Zwei Schwestern, Victoria Rikar, ist eine volle Gestalt mit eigenem Wert. Sie kann sich mitteilen und Gedanken austauschen, ohne zu einer tragischen Persönlichkeit heranzuwachsen wie Corona und Mathilde. Die Verhältnisse liegen wohl hier auch etwas anders, denn ihr Mann ist schwächer als die anderen Männer Stifters, aber schwächer nur im physischen nicht im moralischen Sinne. Im *Witiko* erblicken wir noch einmal solche Frauen. Wentila, die Gattinnen Jugelbachs und Lubomirs, aber man beachtet sie weniger, erfasst, wie man ist, vom grossen historischen Geschehen.

Im Ganzen hat Stifter die Mutter als sympathische wenn auch blasse Figuren gezeichnet. Seltsamerweise hat der Dichter solche Mutter in Relief gestellt, deren Einfluss auf ihre Kinder negativ ist. Da ist zunächst Abdias' Mutter, Esther. Sie ist einfältig, aber schmucksüchtig und will ihrem Knaben ihre eigne Eitelkeit aufbürden. Auf echt orientalische Weise behängt sie Abdias mit Samt, Seide und Juwelen, ja zuweilen mit Mädchenkleidern. Diese erlernte Schmucksucht hilft den erwachsenen Sohn ins Unglück stürzen. Auf nüchternere Art verwöhnt Frau Kneigt ihren Sohn Tiburius (*Waldsteig*), der erst viel später durch die Natur und Liebe geheilt wird. Die negativste Mutter jedoch ist Gertraud, die Gattin des Prokopus. Sie ist eine ungeeichte Mutter aus ehelicher Unzufriedenheit. So hasst sie ihren Erstgeborenen. Der Zweitgeborene wendet sich von ihr hinweg zum Vater, obwohl sie ihn vergottet. Aber sogar hier ist die Rolle der Mutter derjenigen der Frau untergeordnet, denn die eigentliche Tragik besteht ja in dem gegenseitigen Verkennen der Gatten.

Trotz dieser ebenerwähnten Ausnahmen bleibt die mütterliche Figur in Stifters Werken etwas unbefriedigend. Vielleicht nur für uns, die wir gewohnt sind, alle genannten Personen vollständig geformt zu sehen mit all ihren grossen und kleinen Eigenschaften. Für Stifter mag das anders gewesen sein. Denn die Mutter war ihm der Leitstern der Kindheit und druckte dem ganz Kleinen ihren Stempel auf. Die Vater, Oheime, Tanten, ja sogar die Grossmutter konnten erst wirksamen Einfluss ausüben, wenn das Kind schon die Sprache beherrschte und selbständig handeln konnte. Vielleicht dachte Stifter auch daran, dass die Erziehung im systematischen Sinne—darum handelt es sich in seinen Werken—erst im sechsten Lebensjahr beginnt, wenn das Kind der Schulung bedarf.

Vielleicht liegt der Grund für seine "Vernachlässigung" der Mutter tiefer. Wir haben gesehen, dass die Mutter nur dann hervorgehoben werden, wenn die Vater tot oder schwach sind. Sonst bleiben sie im Hintergrund, denn sie haben ihre Pflicht schon getan, als der Jungling und das Mädchen noch kleine Kinder waren. Es wäre dann also nicht Nachlässigkeit, mit der Stifter seine Mutterfiguren gestaltet, sondern eine Art Scheu, sie das tun zu lassen, was der Mann und die Umwelt besser vermögen als sie, nämlich das Erziehen.

HANS JUERGENSEN

The Johns Hopkins University

ETYMOLOGIES OF OLD NORSE PROPER NAMES USED AS POETIC DESIGNATIONS

I *Þuþr*, One of *Odin's* Names (*Gm.* 46, 3) The gen form of this name appears as *Þunns* in the kenning for 'spear,' viz., *Þunns megenáss* (*Lipsmannaflokk*, 3^a, *Sk B I*, 392), so that for the nom. form *Þuþr* we may postulate an earlier form **Þunnr*. The etymology of the word is uncertain, but I believe it can reasonably be explained as a variant form of *Þundr*, which is likewise used as a name for *Odin*.

We may postulate a stem **þun-þ-* with *þ*-extension from the root

pun*-¹ 'stretch, swell,' hence **punþar*, with shift of **p*² > **d* according to Verner's Law, > **pundar* > **pundar* > *pundr*, meaning 'One Swollen with Wrath, The Wrathful God' (cf. with ablaut variation, OE *þundan* 'to swell with wrath' ON *Pund*, the name of a swollen river, *Grm* 21, 1) The form *þupr* could then be derived likewise from **punþar*, but without the shift of **p*² > **d* (punþar* > **punnr* > *þupr*), as a variant form of *pundr*.

I think Gering is right when he says in regard to the form *Þupr* (*Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*, I, 211) " mit dem adj *þupr* (*punnr*) kann er schwerlich identisch sein " The adjective *punnr* (*þupr*) 'thin' must be derived from a root **punn*- with *-*nn*² (cf. Germ *dunn*), which was the result of the assimilation of **nv* > **nn* (1 e, **punn-u* < **punv-a* < **punu*-), whereas the proper name **Þunnr* > *Þupr* may be equated with *Pundr* from a stem **punþ*- with single *-*n* as this appears in the ablaut variations **þan*- **þen*-s (Goth *-þan-gan þin-san*, OE *þin-dan*, etc.). But both words, *Þupr* 'The Wrathful God' and the adjective *þupr* 'thin,' go back to a root denoting the idea of 'stretching out (*thin*), increasing the size, swelling' ('swollen' [with wrath]).

II *Uþr*, One of Odin's Names (*Grm* 46, 3) This name occurs as a name word with *Þupr* in *Grm* 46, 3. The gen form of the word is *unn*s or *unnar*, which appears both as a proper name and as an appellative in kennings pertaining to war (cf. *Sijmons-Gering, op cit*, I, 211). Gering (*ibid*) does not suggest any etymology for the word ("Die etymologie ist unbekannt. ."), but since the word is used only with reference to war, I venture to suggest that the name *Uþr* (< **Unnr*) may be derived from a root **wunn*- 'toil, pain, strife' in ablaut relation to **wunn*-, as in the ON verb *vinna*, *vann unnum* (< **wunn-um*), *unninn* (< **wunn-an*-) The Goth verb *ga-winnan* (πάρχειν) means 'to suffer,' and this sense is preserved in poetry likewise in ON *vinna* 'to suffer' > 'toil, labor' (prose) Goth *wunns** (*wunnum*, II Tim. III, 11) translates Grk πᾶθημα 'pain,' and in OHG we have *helh-wunna* 'a fury' alongside the form *helh-winna*. Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that ON *Uþr* (< **Unnr*) could have been derived from **Wunn-ar* meaning 'Strife, Pain, Suffering,' which is a

¹ Cf the ablaut variation in Goth *-þan-gan* ON *þen-ja* 'to stretch out,' and **þen*-s, with s-extension, in Goth *-þinsan* OHG *ðinsan* 'to stretch'

² Cf Falk-Torp, *Norw-Dan Etym Wtb*, II, 1309, *Tynd*

sense consonant with its usage in kennings and as a proper name for Odín

III *Vip-ofnur, Name of a Cock (Fjm 18, 1)* The difficulty in establishing a satisfactory etymology for this name lies in the second element *-ofnur*—the first element *Vip-* is clear enough (cf *vipr* ‘tree, wood’) There is no evidence that the reading *Vip-ofnur* is incorrect, and therefore all attempts to emendate the form in order to arrive at a plausible etymology (cf Finnur Jónsson, *Lex Poet* ², 622^a, Bjorn M Ólsen, *Arkiv*, 33, 14) must be considered as unjustifiable Gering (*op cit*, I, 414) says regarding the element *-ofnur* “*Ofner* ist beiname *Ópens* (Grm 54⁵) und schlangennamen (Grm 34⁵), aber dieses wort darf man in dem 2 teile des kompositums schwerlich suchen”

We must keep in mind that the proper name *Ofner* 'Snake' represents a poetic designation for 'a weaving, crawling, coiling animal,' derived from the root *of-*³ as this appears in the past participle form *of-unn* from the verb *vefa* 'to weave' (cf. Lat. *serpens* *serpō* 'crawl, coil') There is no reason, however, why the poetic designation *Ofner* should be restricted to the snake. Rather, we may assume that it could be applied to any animal whatsoever of which this basic notion of 'coiling, winding,' etc. was a marked characteristic. When a bird alights upon a tree, he winds his claws about the branch to keep himself from falling. This is just as marked a characteristic of a bird (fowl) as is the 'coiling, winding' movement characteristic of a snake. Now, in *Fjm* 18, 1 *Vip-ofnur* is the name of the cock that stands on the branches of the tree Míme.

Víðofnir heitir, en hann stendr veðrglas
á meibs kvistum Míma

It seems, therefore, plausible to assume that the name *Vīpofnur* was coined *ad hoc* for this passage as a poetic designation for the animal which 'coils, wraps, winds' his claws about the branches of the 'tree' (*Vīp-*), i e, *Vīp-ofnur* = 'Tree Coiler' (cock) just as *Ofnur* = 'Winder, Coiler' (snake).

IV. *Lodd-fáfnir*, Name of a Mythical Character (*Hym* 111, 1).

* The form *Ofner* also occurs (cf. the verbal forms of *ofum* from *vefa*). The form *Ofner* may therefore represent *Ofner* with the shortening of the vowel *ó* > *o* before the two consonants *-fn*.

There can be no doubt that the first element *Lodd-* of this compound is contained in the appellative *lodd-are* 'trickster, Possenreisser' and connected with WGmc *lodd-* (cf OE *lodd-ere* 'beggar,' MLG *lodd-er* MHG *lott-er* 'Taugenichts, Gaukler,' NHG *Lotter* [-*bube*] 'vagabond') and that the second element is identical with the name of the famous dragon or snake *Fáfnir*

The name *Fáfnir* (< **Faðm-nir*) was given to this monster evidently because he guarded the famous treasure in his *embrace* (cf *faþmr* OE *fæðm* 'bosom, outstretched arms'), i e, because he lay coiled about the treasure in order to keep it in his possession. But the substantive *faþmr* may also mean 'string, thread' (cf OHG *fadam* > NHG *Faden* 'string'), as Axel Kock (*Arkiv*, 24, 181 ff) has pointed out in connection with the passage in the *Rígsþula* (16, 2) where the act of weaving thread is described

Sat þar kona	<i>sveigþi rokk,</i>
breiddi faþm,	bjó váþar

Here Kock shows that the phrase *breiddi faþm* does not mean 'she stretched out (*breiða* < **braiðjan* 'to unfold' *breiðr* 'broad') her arms (*faþm*)' but rather 'she prepared (*breiða* < **bi-raiðjan* 'to make ready') the *thread*' or 'she set the *thread* in motion' (*breiða* < **bi-ríða*, causative verb, from *ríða* 'to ride')

In the proper name *Lodd-fáfnir* the element *-fáfnir* most likely connotes the idea of 'string, thread' rather than that of 'embrace' as in the simplex *Fáfnir*. If *Lodd-fáfnir* refers to a 'trickster, Gaukler,' the idea of *deception* must be present, and with the idea of deception the notion of *entangling* (with thread, string) is easily connected, compare the proper name *Vaf-þrúð-nir* 'One mighty (*þrúðr* 'strong, powerful') in weaving' (*Vaf-* *vefa* 'to weave'), i e, 'One skilful in asking *involved, intricate, deceptive* questions' Gering's interpretation (*op cit*, I, 132) of these two names, *Fáfnir* = "der umschlingende," *Lodd-fáfnir* = "der mit gaukelei umstrickende," seems to me to be correct in that he has differentiated the sense of the word *fáfnir* through the verbs *umschlingen* ('to coil') and *umstricken* ('to entangle'), but he does not explain how the word *fáfnir* in the proper name *Lodd-fáfnir* acquired the sense of 'Entangler,' whereas the simplex form *Fáfnir* means 'Embracer.'

V *Drǫttr*, Name of One of the Sons of *Þrǫll* (*Rígsþ* 12, 4). The name *Drǫttr* is undoubtedly derived from the root **dratt-* as this occurs in the verb *dratt-a* 'to move slowly, clumsily', *Drǫttr* = 'The Clumsy, Lazy One' But the question still remains as to the origin of the radical vowel *ǫ* < **a*. There is no evidence that *Drǫttr* represents a substantivized adjective **dratt-w-ar* with *w*-extension (**drattwar* > *drǫttr* with *w*-umlaut of *a*) On the other hand, the form *Drǫttr** could very easily represent the substantive *u*-declension (**drattu* > *drǫttr*), as an analogical formation after the model of those substantives of the *u*-declension which denoted persons, such as *sunr* *mǫgr* 'son,' *ǫrr* (Goth *aurus*) 'messenger,' *vǫttr* 'witness' In conjunction with this pattern there was also the example of original *u*-stems which did not denote persons but were used as proper names designating qualities characteristic of the appellative, such as **haddur* > *hǫðr* = *Hǫðr* 'War' (the treacherous slayer of Balder), and especially the names of animals, such as **mardur* > *mǫrdi* = *Mǫrdi* 'Marten,' a very common proper name, and **kattur* > *kǫttr* 'cat,' which was often used as a nickname (cf *Þorþr kǫttr*) With *Drǫttr* *kǫttr* compare the diminutives *drettingr* *ketlingr* ('kitten'), which were likewise used as nicknames The *u*-declension of *Drǫttr* then evidently brought out the sense of that particular quality ('clumsiness, laziness') characteristic of the thrall

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

* No other case form except the nom *Drǫttr* occurs The names of these sons of *Þrǫll* are all given in the nom case, so that the radical vowel furnishes the only criterion for distinguishing between the *u*- and the *a* declension The names *Hreimr*, *Klurr*, *Lutr* (included in this passage), for which no corresponding appellatives exist and which, therefore, must represent secondary *ad hoc* formations parallel to *Drǫttr*, may belong to either the *a*- or the *u*-declension The name *Drumbr* represents the appellative *drumba* 'a stick of wood' and must therefore represent the *a*-declension of the appellative

AN UNNOTICED MIDDLE BAVARIAN PROSE VERSION
OF PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN PROVERBS

The number of prose versions of the so-called Pseudo-Aristotelian proverbs, known to have been spread chiefly in German-speaking territory, is steadily increasing. The following version, published here the first time, is contained in *Codex Germanicus Monacensis* 4657 of the State Library in Munich. It is a paper manuscript (size 9 x 13 cm, resp. 7 x 11 cm) of the middle of the fifteenth century. The proverb collection forms the introductory part (fol. 45^v) of *Aristoteles ler an Allexander* (fol. 45^v-61^r), a well known medieval treatise, and is followed by numerous other chapters, containing good advice and admonitions given by Aristotle to his disciple Alexander the Great. The last seven lines of 45^v which connect the collection with the rest of the *ler*, begin as follows: *Fur paß spricht er also Edler vnd guotigen furst narg dich nit zu vnkeuschen wercken wann es ist ein eigenschafft der schweyn* etc. The apophthegms, written in one column, cover the space of twenty lines, every line has thirty-three letters in the average. They are written in an even, legible hand-writing. No punctuation mark has been used except a period placed slightly above the line (10 times). The scribe uses, however, a rather unusual symbol to designate word division. It resembles the modern quotation marks, lowered rather close to the line, e.g. *hanben* (13), *gewaltigen* (15). He obviously did not follow any definite rule in word division, as is clearly shown by the following examples: *denem* (16), *weneplich* (46^r) etc. The text reads as follows:

Dy nachgeschriben ler hat gemacht vnd geschickt Aristotileß dem groffen künig Allexander O du edler furst (1) Du solt wenig reden (2) vnd harmlich /ach nit offenwar machen (3) Du solt sein warhafft (4) vnd nicht leichtfertig noch behendt (5) Abchneid den czoren (6) vnd pis nit kriegig (7) Behut dich vor wein (8) Gedenck daß du todlich pist (9) Du solt sein parnhertzig (9a) vnd nyemant vbel reden (10) Gelaub nit leichtklich allen Worten (11) vnd mach dich selber nit vnwissen (12) Deinem feint getraw nit (13) vmb dein verloren oder verdorben güt solt du nit laud haben (14) So deinē nachten vbel czu stet daß sol dich nit erfreuen (15) Mit deinem gewaltigen soltu nit kriegē (16) Dein gehaim soltu nit offenbaren deinem weib noch deinen kiden wann weiber vnd kind dye verweigen allain deß /y nit wissen

When comparing this collection with other collections made available by recent research, one will be struck by the similarity between the above proverbs (= D) and those contained in CGM 357 (= C, cf *PMLA*, LIX, 586). Both versions are part of the same treatise, and both contain the same maxims in the same order and arrangement. The difference in phraseology is rather negligible and concerns only sayings 13 and 16, and the introductory sentence, which is considerably shortened in D. A comparison with C, which owes its existence to the Indersdorfer *Schreiberschule*, will also reveal a slight difference in spelling. In contrast to C, which is a few decades older, D does not show the same predilection for the use of the *y*-symbol, e.g. *haimlich* (2) *haymlich*, *abschneyd* (5) *abschneyd*, *pis* (6) *pys*, *laid* (13) *layd*, *geham* (16) *gehaym*. Moreover, D uses *f*, when C uses *v(u)*, e.g. *leichtfertg* (4) *leichtuertg*, *feint* (12) *veindt*. In proverb (4), *w*-spelling takes the place of *b*-spelling (*behendt wehend*), while in proverb (2) the *w* was retained (*offenwar*).

In spite of these differences, it is obvious that both manuscripts, C as well as D, go back to the same original. One might even be inclined to regard D as a copy of C, were it not for the differences apparent in sayings no. 13 and no. 16. Nothing is known as to its provenance. The only clue in this respect is given by the difference in the spelling of the shifted *-k*-sound. While C shows a shifted sound (e.g. *werchen* 240^r), D documents no shift (*werken*). This phenomenon, accompanied by other Bavarian characteristics, would suggest placing its provenance in neighboring districts less noted for the writing of the shift at that period. The most probable place no doubt is Munich, where the Indersdorfer Augustinians owned a house. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that Duke Albrecht of Munich used to show great interest for all writings dealing with Alexander the Great. Such Alexander-manuscripts are known to have been translated for him by Decanus Johannes of Indersdorf, as an entry in MS CGM 357, fol. 197, tends to show: "*geistliche materi* translated for Duke Albrecht of Bavaria in the year 1437 by Johannes Decanus of Indersdorf" (cf *Cat. Codd. Manu. Scr. Bibl. Regiae Monacensis*, V, 479). Thus it is beyond any doubt that the above proverb collection is the work of a Munich copyist.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

KLAR WIE KLOSSBRUH'

Klosse are a well-known German dish. The water they have been cooked in would, technically, be *Klossbrue*. Yet, as it has no further use, it justifies a special name no more than would the water sausages were cooked in. There is no term of the type **Wurstbrue*. *Fleischbrue* "bouillon, broth," on the other hand, is a desired product.

The currency of the term *Klossbrue* is restricted to the idiomatic phrase "klar wie Klossbruh'." As *Kloss*-water is all but clear, we should expect such a meaning as in English "clear as mud." Yet, on the contrary, the meaning of our phrase is "very clear." All this points in the direction of a folk-etymology.

An analogous phrase, which sheds some light on it, is current in Luxembourg: *kloor wër Konviktszopp*¹ "clear as convent-soup." (*Konvikt* is defined¹ as "von Geistlichen geführtes Pensionat einer höheren Knabenanstalt") In nearby Treves we find a phrase *klaor wër Konviktskaffi*² "clear as convent coffee." It is also well known that Walther von der Vogelweide, in a short poem, complains about the hospitality of the monks of Tegernsee who treated him to pure water. Thus, it seems that the soups and beverages of convents, at least those offered to boarders, were sarcastically compared to water and held up as examples of "clearness."

Based on the foregoing, I suggest that *Klossbrue* could be a corruption of **Klosterbrue*, brought about by later popular etymology, and supported by alliteration in the phrase *klar wër Klossbrue*. No doubt, the alliteration accounts to no small measure for the currency and stability of the phrase.

PAUL FORCHHEIMER

Columbia University

¹ J. Tockert, "Zur Luxemburgischen Studenten-, Pennaler- und Schulsprache" *Jahrbuch 1933 der Luxemburgischen Sprachgesellschaft*

² *Trierische Heimat*, nos 34, 1934, p. 44

REVIEWS

Germany's Stepchildren By SOLOMON LIPTZIN Philadelphia
The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1944 298 pp

Germany's stepchildren are her Jews. In this book Professor Liptzin traces the history of Jewish attempts at assimilation from the Enlightenment to the present, as exemplified in the thought of individual German-Jewish intellectuals. The book thus stands on the periphery of literature, only twelve of the odd three dozen figures discussed in it were primarily creative writers, and even these are treated as publicists rather than as men of letters.

Professor Liptzin's thesis is that from the *Aufklärung* through the nineteenth century, German-Jewish intellectuals either tried to escape from their connection with the Jewish race (through intermarriage, assimilation, baptism, social camouflage), or they propounded theories which would enable them to walk the tight-rope of a German-Jewish dualism. The birth of the Zionist movement marks the turning point in Jewish thinking on the subject of assimilation. The nationalist-racial dreams of Moses Hess now become political realities. The triumph of the Nazis and their racial doctrines put a final stop to the assimilationist movement in Germany. It compelled German Jews to awake to the realization that neither assimilation nor the dual life of German and Jew was a solution to the Jewish problem. "Hitler thus put a violent end to the German mirage that has dazzled Jewish eyes since the Age of the Enlightenment and, by dissipating a tragic duality, quickened the tempo of Jewish regeneration." This Jewish regeneration, also called the "Jewish renaissance," "national humanism," "Jewish pan-humanism," is a re-emergence of national-racial-ethnic consciousness, which grew out of Zionism or ran parallel to it.

This thesis Professor Liptzin develops and defends with vigor and skill. That his enthusiasm for the cause should damage his sense of objectivity towards the other side is understandable, but it does lead him into making some "loaded" judgments. Thus he writes: "While the Protestant composer Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy wrote Church music, little suspecting that it would one day be banned in his native Germany as non-Aryan music, his aunts vied with one another in their devotion to Catholicism" (p. 23). The gibe hardly seems justified. After all, if Mendelssohn was a sincere Protestant, or, if in composing Protestant music, he was merely obeying a sincere artistic instinct, why should it make any difference to him that a hundred years later the Nazis would ban his music, even if he could have foreseen this weird event?

This is not a trifling point, but goes to the root of Professor Liptzin's whole argument. A repeated pattern of experience in his book runs as follows. A Jewish intellectual tries the way of assimilation (total or partial) as a solution for the dualism of German and Jew. He apparently expects the Gentiles to be in raptures over the conversion and to welcome him with open arms. He therefore throws himself into the activities of the community with all the vigor and self-confidence of one who "belongs", only to find that Gentile society is still suspicious and hostile and resentful of the new role he is assuming in its midst. He then becomes bitter and disillusioned, feels that his liberalism was all a mistake and makes good his apostasy by returning to the fold of his ancestral faith. From Heine and Hess to Doblin and Ludwig Lewisohn, the pattern of conduct is the same. One wonders whether the behavior does not reflect more on the Jewish victim than on the un-Christian Gentiles who have caused it? Does it not show that these converts never really believed in the liberal ideals they professed, but merely hoped to use assimilation as a means for gaining material or social advantages for themselves? Job cries to God: "Yea though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." And Spinoza writes: "He who loves God truly, must not expect that God should return his love." Anyone who abandons his tribal loyalties to embrace the ideals of Plato, Montaigne, Spinoza, Kant and Goethe, should not become disloyal to these ideals because reactionary Gentiles are untrue to them. How much more admirable was the attitude of men like Stefan Zweig, who refused to recant their liberalism in adversity, but preferred the escape through suicide to that of seeking shelter in a tribal temple!

The last chapters of Professor Liptzin's book show how deep is the deterioration in the mental fibre of modern man. These chapters deal with the new conception of the Jewish mission in life, as developed by the adherents of the new Jewish renaissance. In the earlier nineteenth century the myth was current among German-Jewish intellectuals that the Jewish mission was to spread cosmopolitanism, peace, freedom, justice and equality among the nations of the world (cf. p. 36). Thus Jewish liberals could look down with contempt on the nationalist strivings of their Gentile German neighbors. With the rise of Zionism, certain Jewish intellectuals began themselves to yearn for the fleshpots of nationalism. Publicists like Theodor Lessing, Martin Buber, Richard Beer-Hoffmann, Max Brod, Arnold Zweig, Erich Kahler became adherents of this new religion. Unfortunately, by this time it had become painfully obvious that, whatever it may have been originally, nationalism was now a force for evil, especially with its new excrescence of racialism.

In this dilemma the Jewish nationalists hit upon a brilliant solution. *Jewish* nationalism will be different. It will avoid all the weaknesses, excesses, vices of Gentile nationalism. It will stand as a beacon of light, tolerance, co-operation, understanding, self-

sacrifice for humanity. There will be no hatred of other nations, no oppression, no arrogance, no chauvinism. Max Brod, who coined the phrase "national humanism," denied that national self-preservation must lead inevitably to hatred of other nationalities. He felt that perhaps it was the mission of the Jews to cleanse the concept of nationalism from the filth and exaggerations of recent decades. Jews had often furnished examples of unselfish love for other peoples and, should they return to Palestine, would again demonstrate the possibility of a more moral type of nationalism. It is perhaps providential, he muses, that the Jews, upon their return to Palestine, will find the Arabs there, for this will enable them to test the new conception of nationalism immediately (p 271). It would be unfair to sneer at this nonsense in the light of the hindsight afforded by recent events, but did it need such events to demonstrate the folly of such arrogance?

Inspired by the vision of a Jewish renaissance, the Jewish intellectuals went chauvinist with a vengeance. Thus we find Martin Buber talking of the "dark forces within the [Jewish] soul," condemning "barren intellectualism," confirming the Nazi accusation that the Jews are "an Oriental enclave in the Occident" (p 260). Or there is Erich Kahler, who finds Judaism superior to Christianity, for "while Christianity regards the sacrifice of Jesus as a past act that brought salvation to all people for all time, Judaism insists on unceasing sacrifice day by day as its mode of living. With justice as its foundation, it strives to rear a marvellous structure of pure brotherly love" (pp 276-77). Christians, he believes, have an uneasy conscience in the presence of Jews, who do not depend on armies or navies, but pursue justice unceasingly, practice peace on earth, and sacrifice themselves for moral values (p 277). Hence, if western civilization should perish through war and reaction, the Jews will have the comfort of knowing that they bear no responsibility whatever for the universal catastrophe, and that they maintained to the end their post as sentinels of the higher moral values and their faith in a type of man who was fashioned in the likeness of God (p 281).

Such thoughts, Professor Liptzin assures us, are "typical" of the contemporary Jewish renaissance. They find parallels in the writings of Ahad Ha'am and Richard Beer-Hoffmann, Martin Buber, Max Brod, Arnold Zweig. One shudders to think what may be in store for a new nation whose intellectuals are capable of such hubris or such self-deception. Is this not the German tragedy all over again?

Though the reviewer is completely unconvinced by Professor Liptzin's thesis, he must commend the author for his clear and skilful presentation of the subject. *Germany's Stepchildren* is a valuable study of the German-Jewish psyche.

No Voice is Wholly Lost By HARRY SLOCHOWER New York,
Creative Age Press, 1945 xix + 404 pp

In this book Professor Slochower has made a noble attempt to survey and classify the forces and currents in European and American literature between the two world wars. Like so many students of the contemporary scene, the author is distressed by the bewildering and chaotic multiplicity of tendencies, by the lack of common cultural standards. However, he does seem able to reduce the confusion to some semblance of order. He finds four major traditions in contemporary literature: 1 sceptical, relativist individualism, 2 the belief in an absolute of some sort either *Blut und Boden* (Slochower calls it "the Antaeus tradition"), or Neo-Thomism, or pure *Geist* (philosophical, aesthetic, aristocratic, democratic), 3 the religion of fascism, 4 a movement towards a communal personality to replace the bankrupt individualism of the last four centuries.

The title indicates the author's own bias towards the latter ideal, which is moreover buttressed with the authority of the Marxian dialectic. Accordingly, liberal individualism is condemned, as fiddling while Rome burns. So is Fascist totalitarianism, though it too had its own brand of communal personality. The hope of the future lies in a "social humanism, which on the basis of Marxian directives, is laboring toward a state which would allow the greatest individual expression within an ordered communality" (xix). The best contemporary literature is groping towards a new ideal of integration, which is the modern equivalent of the medieval salvation. Professor Slochower believes that this ideal will take the form of a dialectical humanism which will allow for an interplay between individual genius and public organization (381). And the outstanding champions of that ideal are André Malraux and the Thomas Mann of the Joseph tetralogy.

A curious feature of this study is that both its hero (Marxist literature) and its villain (Fascist literature) occupy a conspicuously small space in the book. The section on Fascism deals largely with the ideology of the movement, and at that only through the semi-Fascist Spengler. Fascist literature itself is represented only by the aged Hauptmann and Hans Fallada, neither of whom was a Nazi, as Slochower himself realizes. On the other hand writers like Hans Grimm, Paul Ernst, Kolbenheyer, Hans Friedrich Blunck, Hanns Johst are not even mentioned. I am sure that Professor Slochower knows the writings of these men, who were passionately wedded to an ideal of the communal soul and who talk much of freedom and other noble things. Professor Slochower would no doubt point to the slight discrepancy between the noble ideals expressed by these Nazi writers and the reality with which Hitler and Co. presented the world. One wishes he would apply the same yardstick to the Soviet writers.

Professor Slochower's selection of writers for discussion is not altogether satisfactory. If Bernard Shaw is to be treated at all, he surely deserves more than a single page. Carl Zuckmayer is merely mentioned in a footnote, Mauriac, Bernanos, Hermann Hesse, Ernst Wiechert are not mentioned at all.

The first of the many mottos which grace this book is a quotation from George Santayana: "Exiles in this world—and what noble mind from Empedocles down, has not had that feeling?" This suggests that the current mania, shared by our author, for seeing our age as the most complex, most chaotic, most split in the whole history of Western culture, is a slight exaggeration. We now know that the traditional habit of seeing a unity in past eras is highly illusory. For every orthodoxy there has always been at least one heterodoxy. Why should it be any different in our day? Why must every artist today work for the emergence of a communal personality? There will always be room in any society for individualists and "communists," both among the masses and the élite. We can well stand artists like André Gide and John Steinbeck. When we consider the vast mass of published literature today, it speaks well for our cultural integration that it can be reduced to four or even ten major tendencies. This may not be in the interest of the communal personality, but it lends vitality to literature, as a comparison of Professor Slochower's treatment of Russian and non-Russian writers clearly shows.

These are some of the misgivings that the reviewer had with regard to Professor Slochower's book. But he can say sincerely that a careful study of it fills him with admiration for the author's wide reading in the literature and philosophy of our day.

HARRY STEINHAUER

University of Manitoba

Functional Change in Early English By DONALD W. LEE. A Dissertation . . . Columbia University. George Banta Publishing Co., Menasha, Wisc., 1948. Pp. xi, 129.

This interesting dissertation is a history of "functional change" or "conversion" from the earliest time the author thinks it was practiced up to 1600.

In the first chapter the author defines the problem of functional change, reviewing earlier discussions of it and attempting to fix its origin. Strictly speaking, conversion is a Modern English phenomenon in word formation whereby one part of speech can be used for another, e. g. a *noun* for a *verb*, with no changes in form, except the inflexional endings. One would *a priori* guess that it

would not arise until the English language was well on its way toward shedding its inflexional endings and tightening up its rules of word order, as these rules often enough are the only arbiters of the meaning, e g *take my hand* and *hand me the book*. Still it must have had its roots in Old English and even Germanic Word Formation and the author shows clearly its connections with this inflexional past of the language. In OE, as in other Germanic Dialects, the weak verbs, being new in Germanic, were very frequently formed from nouns and adjectives. Before the i-umlaut period one could form the verb **dōm-ġan* from the noun **dōm-az* or the verb **luf-ōġan* from the noun **luf-ō*. What happened here was that the root-syllable of the nouns was abstracted from the endings and used as a root-syllable of the verbs with the addition of the verbal flexional endings, a process not essentially different from the modern *hand he hand-s me*. But the i-umlaut played havoc with some of these sets, so that after it OE would have the sets *dōm*: *dēman*, and *lufu* *lufian*, where the root-syllable of the verb of the first class was irretrievably changed, and only the second class retained the similarity in its root-syllable. Now the set *lufu*. *lufian* would by the usual sound and analogical changes develop into *love*. *love* in Mod. English, as it seems a perfect example of the modern conversion. Here then we no doubt have already in OE the pattern according to which the Modern English conversion developed, and to bring it home to us the author lists about 230 sets of the type *luve* *lurien* from the transitional period between Old and Middle English (the 12th century), sets which all survived during the next two or three centuries so that there can be no question about their influence,—and there were many more that did not survive.

Having established this relationship of the conversion to OE denominative verbs, the author goes on to classify the sets noun-verb according to their meaning into twelve classes which he labels A-L. He finds that these classes persist even during the following centuries of conversion, and that the classes F, G—to *hammer* and *to cloak*—are especially common.

The investigation is not restricted to noun-verbs, it also includes verb-nouns and adjective-noun-verbs. For the verb-nouns, the author similarly scans Old English, where he finds the practice of deriving nouns from verbs much less in evidence (especially when restricted to words with the same root-syllables) than the practice of forming verbs from nouns. Still he finds that whatever verb-derivatives there are can be classified according to their meaning into five classes labelled A-E, of which I shall only mention A and C, the nomen actionis *run*, and the nomen agentis (*chimney*) *sweep*. In connection with this latter formation, I am surprised that the author nowhere mentions the two common OE ways of forming nomina agentis from verbs, viz. the old Germanic way illustrated by *bēōdan* *boda*, *witan* *wita*, *flēōtan* *flota*, and the later Germanic way, based on the Latin suffix *-arius*, and illustrated in OE by *dōm*,

dēman dōmere, in Mod English by the very frequent *cut cutter* type. Of course neither of these formations could lead the way to later conversion (though *wita* might have led to *wit* as far as the sound development goes). But there is little doubt that the infrequency of the type *chimney sweep*, noticed but not explained by the author in the 14th century (p. 64), is due to the frequency of the type *sweeper*, at that time and ever after. The omission is all the more remarkable since the author lists other verb-noun sets found in OE such as *riðan rād*, *būgan bēag*, *bēoðan bod*, and others that do not have the same root-syllable as the verb, though of course he is most interested in the ones that have the same root-syllable, as being possible ancestors of the later converted verb-nouns.

The four remaining chapters are devoted to the thirteenth, the fourteenth, the fifteenth, and the sixteenth centuries respectively, the author listing all sets of conversions, nouns-verbs, verbs-nouns, adjectives-nouns-verbs, etc.; that he could find in the *NED*. In so doing he pays attention to the origin (native, Scandinavian, French, etc.) of the sets, and classifies them according to the A-L, A-E semasiological classes mentioned above. He also summarizes the development within each century, excepting the thirteenth and the fourteenth, which he treats together.

In the preface the author confesses to a sneaking desire to hit back at those educators who would not stand for using *contact* as a verb. And it must be admitted that he has here ammunition for an annihilating blow at these purists. But perhaps the conservative educators could hit back at him with another study, a study of conservation, a study of conflicting types, as the *sweep* and *sweeper* mentioned above, or the *doom deem doomed* that still survives in spite of all conversion.

Still, the author obviously did not set out to do that, but what he wanted to do he has done with thoroughness and distinction, for which we all may be grateful to him.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer. A new modern English prose translation by R. M. LUMIANSKY, published together with the original Middle English text of the General Prologue and the Nun's Priest's Tale. Preface by Mark Van Doren. Illustrated by H. Lawrence Hoffman. New York: Simon and Schuster, [1948]. Pp. xxx + 346.

The wish to make Chaucer more generally accessible to the modern is laudable, and it may be said at once that Mr. Lumiansky's translation is managed in firm, clear prose. One may suppose, however, that almost any change from a great original is bound to

be disappointing, and anyone who really knows Chaucer's verse will think it perhaps better that even the beginner should be sent to the Middle English at once. Of the Squire "he was as joyful as the month of May" is not the same as "He was as freshe as is the month of May", of the Prioress, "whose smile was very quiet and simple" misses the staccato touch of "ful simple and coy", of the decoration of the Temple of Mais the "gnarled, knotty, barren trees and sharp, hideous stumps" and the "rushing wind" that made the "gate tremble" miss something of the onomatopoeia of the original. Arcite's "Alas, the great woe and the sharp pains that I have suffered" loses the material and funereal drumbeat of his own lament. Never in the wide world could the Wife of Bath have said "I never made love from expediency"—at least never in just that way. The Clerk's Envoy suffers an almost seasick change in the magnificent passage regarding wives as strong as camels "don't allow men to do injustices to you" for "Ne suffreth nat that men yow doon offence". In the speech of Sir Thopas "I shall pierce your stomach before nine o'clock, if I can . . ." is rather different from "'Thy mawe Shal I percen if I may Er it be fully pryme of day. . .'" The quality and color as well as the rhythm and motion of the original are missing. "Chirking" is a much more mysterious word than "confused cries" will render. "Shode" is the parting of the hair and not the "temple". "Sovereyn prys" is not "valuable loot" but "splendid renown" or even "excellent reputation". A grossly misleading statement is quoted in the introduction "Setting himself against the weight of medieval authority, Chaucer wrote of English men and women and wrote in the English tongue". The stylized illustrations have a burlesque quality far cruder than Chaucer's humor. One may fear that they may sell the book to Hollywood.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

BRIEF MENTION

Georg Buchner, Gesammelte Werke, mit einem Lebensbild herausgegeben von CARL SEELIG. Artemis Verlag, Zurich, 1944. 319 pp. Die verschiedenen Buchner-Ausgaben, die in den letzten Jahren auf dem Markt erschienen sind, legen ein beredtes Zeugnis ab für die wachsende Popularität dieses Dichters. Die von Carl Seelig besorgte Neuauflage wendet sich augenscheinlich an dieses breitere Publikum: sie macht keinerlei Ansprüche auf Vollständigkeit oder kritische Verarbeitung des Details, nicht nur die Paraphrasen zu den Dichtungen sondern auch die Übersetzungen Buchners aus Hugo sind ausgeschieden worden. Auch die Briefe sind in keiner Weise vollständig wiedergegeben: vor allem eine

ganze Reihe von längeren und kürzeren Briefen an die Familie des Dichters sowie verschiedene Briefe an Gutzkow, deren Ausscheidung am wenigsten einleuchtet, wurden ausgelassen (dagegen finden sich zwei Briefe an die Familie, die z. B. die Bergemannsche Insel-Ausgabe nicht enthält). Durch erläuternde Zwischenbemerkungen wurden die aufgenommenen Briefe immer sehr geschickt zu einer Art Autobiographie des Dichters verarbeitet. Der *Hessische Landbote* erscheint selbstverständlich ungekürzt, aber von Buchners Antrittsvorlesung in Zürich nur die erste Hälfte. Besonders massiv tritt Seeligs Nachwort (unter dem Titel "Lebensbild eines jungen Genies") auf — mit fast 40 Seiten! — in dem das Ende Buchners vielleicht doch ein wenig zu sehr dramatisiert worden ist. Waren kritische Ausgaben unserer Dichter heute anderwärts erhältlich, würde man das Fehlende in der vorliegenden Ausgabe wohl nicht so schmerzlich vermissen. Für das allgemeine Lesepublikum fielen sich schwerlich eine geschmackvollere Ausgabe als die vorliegende denken.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

Smith College

The World of Learning Second Edition London Europa Publications Ltd, 1948 Pp xii + 824 60s. A great improvement over the first edition (1947), which I reviewed in *MLN*, LXII, 286. Information has been received from so many more institutions that the work has increased to more than half again its original size. Introductory pages about Unesco have been added, and there is now a list of abbreviations. This time the Institute for Advanced Study has found a place, though the names of its professors are not listed. In spite of my protest two years ago, the Collège de France is still placed under "National High Schools and Colleges," and the American Philosophical Society is still entered as if it were composed of professors of philosophy. Evidently the editors are unaware of the fact that, when Benjamin Franklin founded this society in the eighteenth century, he used the word "philosophical" in the sense that was then familiar to the learned world. If the book is to replace *Minerva*, such slips should be avoided, and there should be an index of personal names. Even as it is, the work should be found in all libraries of consequence.

H. C. L.

CORRESPONDENCE

Kanke(r) dort 'A STATE OF SUSPENSE, A DIFFICULT POSITION' The solution proposed (*MLN* LXIV, 264) by Professor Spargo for the Chaucerian nonce-word *kanke(r) dort* (*Troilus and Criseyde* II, 1752 'Was Troilus

nought in a *kankedort*, variant *kanke(r)dort*, the word rhyming with *comfort* and *sort*), which was to divide the word into *cankered* 'crab-like' and *ort* (*ord*) 'place' (Troilus found himself in a 'region, or area, where crab-like or uncertain behavior prevails,' with allusion to the 'crab-like' movement of the sun during the summer solstice) may be questioned on two grounds

- 1 *ord* is never attested in English in the general meaning (extant in German) 'place, area,' only in the original meaning of that Germanic word family 'point' (of weapons), coupled (in the *Beowulf*) with *edge*, or else in the meaning derived from 'point' 'beginning' (coupled with *end*)
- 2 In order to express the simple idea 'Troilus found himself in a quandary,' Chaucer would not coin such a laborious compound which has no antecedent in the English, or in any, language. The situation requires a direct, graphic, well established word—whose 'nonce-word' character is only due to our lack of information, in other words, *kanke(r)dort* must be rather a hapax than a nonce word

I translated the term above with 'quandary,' and I wonder if we could not trace the etymology of *kanke(r)dort* to just this English word. I have shown in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* XLII, 405 ff. that *quandary* (*quandorum*, *quondorum*) and *conundrum* (*conimbrum*, *quonundrum*, *quadrundum*) represent one word family which goes back to Fr *calembredaine* 'nonsense talk' and *calembour* (originally with final *d* as *calembredaine* shows) 'pun,' words which in turn are to be retraced to a compound of OF *bourde* 'idiotic talk' (*embourder* 'to cheat'), from Lat *bŭrdus* 'mule,' with either *caput* (> Prov *capbord* 'idiotic') or *quadrifurcum* (> Fr *carrefour* 'cross road,' a *califourchon* 'straddling'). Now E *quandary* 'a state of suspense' (originally probably 'suspense caused by insidious talk') is first attested about 1580 (Lily) and E *conundrum* 'puzzle' (originally 'puzzling talk') about 1596 (Nashe, Ben Jonson)—earlier, that is, than Fr *calembour* (1768) and its dialectal variant *equilboudie* (1658), but the widespread dialectal area of the *calembredaine* family vouches for a popular Old French stem which, given the idealistic character of Old French literature, has had little chance to be attested. If Chaucer's *kanke(r)dort* can be brought into relationship with this family we would have come upon the earliest example of it in English—which would *par ricochet* imply antedatation also for the corresponding French antecedent. Indeed, why should *kanke(r)dort* in Chaucer not be the oldest attestation—in English!—of Fr *calembour* (*d*)? The term would show already with Chaucer some of the numerous phonetic alterations that accompany the transplantation of the word family on English soil: *calembourd* > **kanembord* (cf. the parallel development of *calembredaine* > *conimbrum*, with *n-* replacing *-l-* because of the following *-m*) > **kanemdord* (with the second *-d-* inducing the first, cf. *quadrundum* < *calembredaine*) > *kankedort* (the second *-k* repeating the first), with the variant *kankerort* (in which the second *-r-* produces the first, cf. *catterpillar* < Fr **chatte peleur*). If it should be objected that I take too much liberty with the French word stem in allowing for such exor-

bitant phonetic alterations, I would remind the reader of the equally violent changes undergone by the parallel *calembredaine* while developing, after many hesitations, either to *conundrum* or to *quandary*, and also of the general linguistic experience, pointed out most convincingly by Karl Jaberg, that jocular terms show a particular phonetic instability (cf also such Anglo-French words as *skulduggery*, *galavage* etc.) A word meaning 'puzzle, fix, pun, blunder' is particularly exposed to alteration the Fr word family *calembour* (*calembredaine*) itself is, as was shown above, the product of an alteration of the stem *bourd* by the jocular or pejorative Fr prefix *cal-* in which different stems are merged—and such a blend is semantically justified by the meaning of the family which implies a duality (of possible resolutions, interpretations, etc.), an *ambiguity*.

With the equation *calembour*(*d*) > *kanke*(*r*) *dort*, our hapax is placed in the framework of a thriving, picturesque and jocular word-family which must have been familiar to Chaucer in more than one variant

LEO SPITZER

REPLY TO PROFESSOR ORSINI. Ricevo l'estratto di una recensione del Prof. Napoleone Orsini al mio volume *Italiensche Humanismus*. Circa quanto vi è detto desidero far notare

1 Presso l'Istituto di Studi di Politica Internazionale, indicato come una istituzione fascista, diresse fino al 1943 una collezione storica Adolfo Omodeo. All'Istituto collaboravano Federigo Chabod (oggi direttore dell'Istituto "Croce"), G. Pepe, A. J. Jemolo, L. Dal Pane ecc.

2 La "Rinascita" era l'organo dell'Istituto di Studi sul Rinascimento, ed era diretta da G. Papini in quanto presidente dell'Istituto stesso. Sulla "Rinascita" pubblicò vari articoli lo stesso prof. Napoleone Orsini, dagli Stati Uniti vi collaborarono J. G. Fucilla e Hans Baion.

3 Il mio vol. citato a p. 353 dal titolo *Il Rinascimento italiano* è una raccolta di testi e documenti riferiti negli originali per esercitazioni universitarie. Oltre la sezione di lettere di Cola di Rienzo, vi sono larghe sezioni di testi sulla vita attiva, sulla vita civile (cfr p. 149 e sgg.), sulla religiosità del Rinascimento. E Cola vi è presentato non maestro, ma, se mai, discepolo ideale del Petrarca (p. 24 "Cola sentì in Petrarca un maestro").

4 La religiosità cristiana del Rinascimento avevo, fra l'altro, sostenuto in un saggio del 1938 (*La "dignitas hominis" e la letteratura patristica*), come può vedersi anche dal cenno dell'ultimo volume del *Repertorio* del Prezzolini (sotto la voce *Rinascimento*).

5 Il tema della "vita civile" avevo sottolineato, anche con testi inediti, nel mio volume del 1941 *Filosofi italiani del 400*.

EUGENIO GARIN

University of Florence

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

DECEMBER, 1949

Number 8

THE SOURCES OF *THE DOUBLE MARRIAGE*

BY FLETCHER AND MASSINGER

No source has ever been suggested for *The Double Marriage*, a tragedy by Fletcher and Massinger, little known today, although it is an excellent example of the dramatic technique which made Fletcher and his collaborators seem to their contemporaries the equals, if not the superiors, of Shakespeare and Jonson. This play, like the well known *Maid's Tragedy*, is characterized by a series of extraordinary situations growing out of the conflicting duties which beset the hero. The most striking scene is that in which Virolet rejects his wife, Juliana, after she has undergone torture to save his life. His apparently heartless action is motivated by the obligation he has incurred to Martia, the daughter of a duke turned pirate, whom he has promised to marry in return for her setting him free from her father's ship. Consequently, Juliana must be divorced, and Virolet is in a typically Fletcherian dilemma.

In Lazarus Pyott's *The Orator* (1596)¹ is a story (Declamation 64) "Of the husband that did put away his wife, who being tortured, did yet save his life in not confessing that he pretended to murder the Tyrant." In the same collection is the story (Declama-

¹ A translation of Alexandre van den Busche (called Le Sylvain), *Epitomes De Cent Histories Tragiques*, Paris, 1581. A second edition appeared with the title, *Histoires Tragiques, Rédigées En Epitome*, Paris, 1588. Pyott's translation has been the subject of a series of misapprehensions. It was once assumed that Pyott was a pseudonym of Anthony Munday. Celeste Turner shows in her *Anthony Munday (Univ. of California Publications in English, II, 1928, 100-2)* that this is not so, but in a description of Pyott's *Orator* (*ibid.*, p. 196) she suggests that some of the stories were written by Pyott himself. In fact, they are all translated from the French.

tion 48) of a man who married the daughter of a pirate captain when she released him from her father's prison

A number of details make it seem likely that Fletcher and Massinger used these stories. Violet, like the husband of Declamation 64, plots the death of a tyrant, and Juliana, though tortured, confesses nothing. The husband of the story then rejects his wife because she is barren, whereas in the play, Violet rejects Juliana in order to be true to his promise to Martia. In the rejection scene (III, 1, Cambridge Edition VI, 371),² however, Violet's lawyer makes barrenness the legal basis for demanding divorce. In Declamation 48 the hero marries the captain's daughter, but is then disinherited by his father, who had refused to ransom him. At this trying *impasse* the father prophesies disaster for a marriage so obviously based on female lust, while the son defends the conduct of his wife and himself by pointing out that she, unlike his father, had made a sacrifice in order to save his life, and that the least he could do was to marry her. In *The Double Marriage* Pandulpho, Violet's father, is outraged by the rejection of Juliana and strongly opposes the second marriage. Martia herself points out (III, 1, Cam VI, 370) how much she has sacrificed for Violet, she insists upon the nice point that Juliana's sacrifice was no more than duty. Just so, the son of the story contrasts the disinterested behavior of his wife with his father's neglected duty.

The Orator merits a brief description, since it has seldom been noticed by scholars. It is closely related to the numerous collections of short stories and anecdotes which were so popular with the Elizabethans, but its form is unique. What distinguishes *The Orator* from Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* or the other well known collections is that Busche merely summarizes each story up to its climactic situation as an explanatory preface to the "declamations" made by two of the chief characters. Thus the reader is given no more of the preliminaries than are absolutely essential to the delectation of the choice morsel of the story. This is invariably a situation as startling, as improbable, and as puzzling as the two already described, and in each case the two characters chosen present exactly

² All references to the "Beaumont and Fletcher" canon are to the edition of A. Glover and A. R. Waller, Cambridge, 1905-12. Since this edition is based on the Folio of 1679, which rarely makes any scene division, I indicate the volume and page of the Cambridge Edition, hereafter referred to as Cam.

opposite views, so that their speeches constitute a formal debate. The emphasis is upon oratory, as the title of Pyott's translation suggests. In a foreword to the reader, Pyott says of the "declamations"

In these thou maiest learne Rhetoricke to inforce a good cause, and art to impugne an ill.³

In a similar way the situations of *The Double Marriage* borrowed from *The Orator* are used to produce a climactic scene in Act III (Cam vi, 364-73), in which Violet, Juliana, Martia, and Pandulpho debate the involved question of who is behaving most honorably. The scene is probably Fletcher's,⁴ and it is tempting to suppose that he himself was responsible for choosing these "declamations" as the sources for the play, for they presented, ready made, the sort of situation which was his specialty. Only the slightest alterations were necessary. In this case the chief alteration is the neat stitching together of the two stories, but Fletcher makes one characteristic addition—an unexpected fillip to end the scene. When Violet has won his divorce and has been left alone with Martia, she, true to Fletcherian formula, suggests that they go to bed, to which he replies surprisingly

As soon to hell, to any thing I hate most,
You must excuse me, I have kept my word
You are my Wife, you now enjoy my fortune
Which I have done to recompence your bounty
But to yield up those chaste delights and pleasures,
Which are not mine, but my first vowes. —
Good heaven forgive, no, no
Honor, and wealth, attendance, state, all duty,
Shall wait upon your will, to make you happy,
But my afflicted mind, you must give leave Lady,
My weary Trunk must wander

(III, i, Cam vi, 372-3)

Even at this new turn to the situation the emphasis falls, as it falls in *The Orator*, upon rhetoric and eloquence.

So close is the correspondence between *The Orator's* methods and the dramatic technique of Fletcher that one could easily imagine the playwright discovering here the formula which was to

³ Lazarus Pyott, *The Orator*, A 4

⁴ See E. H. C. Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1927), p. 226

be the basis of his success. It is unfortunate that this plausible theory is not supported by the chronology of Fletcher's plays. *The Maid's Tragedy*, *A King and No King*, and others equally characteristic of Fletcher and Company were written several years before the plays based on *The Orator*. One can say only that it was natural for Fletcher to be drawn to stories which lent themselves so readily to the sort of drama he wrote.⁵

The historical background and the names of the characters in *The Double Marriage* were not provided by *The Orator*, but by Thomas Danett's translation of *The Historie of Philip De Commines*, published in 1596. The seventh book contains the story of Ferrand of Naples, a tyrant against whom the barons and princes of the realm rebelled. The description of the evils of the reign is used by Massinger,⁶ sometimes *verbatim*, for the speeches of Virolet and Juliana in Act I.

A part of Commines' description reads

as touching pardon or mercie never was any to be obtained at his hands, as divers of his neerest kinsmen and friends have often told me, neither had he at any time pitie or compassion upon his poore people, to ease them of payments and subsidies. Moreover, he used within his realme all trade of merchandise himselfe, so far forth that he delivered swine to his people to feede, which they were constrained to fat to further their sale: and if any of them happened to die, they were forced to make them good. In those places where the oile olive groweth (namely in Pouille) he and his sonne bought it all up at their owne price: and in like maner the corne yet greene upon the ground, which they sold againe as deere as was possible, and if the price thereof happened to fall, they constrained their subjects to buye it: besides that, during the time of their sale, all other were forbidden to sell. If any of their noble men were a good husband, and thought to spare some good thing for himselfe, they would forthwith desire to borrow it, and if he made refusall, he was con-

⁵ *The Orator* is the probable source of another play in the "Beaumont and Fletcher" canon, *The Queen of Corinth*. H. F. Schwarz pointed out many years ago ("One of the Sources of the *Queen of Corinth*," *MLN*, xxiv, 1909, 76-7) that the dénouement of this play is very similar to a story in the *Gesta Romanorum*. Not only does this story appear in *The Orator* as Declamation 61, but two other declamations (54 and 68) are based on strikingly similar situations. It seems likely that Busche and Pyott were intermediaries between the *Gesta Romanorum* and the authors of *The Queen of Corinth*.

⁶ The first act of the play is usually assigned to Massinger. See Oliphant, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

strained to deliver it perforce so that they used to take from them the races of their horses (wherewith that countrie aboundeth) and to cause them to be broken & kept to their own use yea and that such numbers as well of horses as of mares and colts, that they were esteemed many thousands, which also they sent to feede in diuers places in the pastures of their noble men and other their subjects to their great losse and damage Both of them had forced many women, and as touching the Church, they had it in no reuelence, neither would obey the lawes thereof, so far forth that they sold Bishoprikes for monie, as for example, the Bishoprike of Tarente sold to a Jew by King *Ferrande* for thirteene thousand ducats ⁷

In *The Double Marriage* we find

Vir since this *Aragoman* tyrant, *Ferrand*,
Seiz'd on the gover[n]ment, there's nothing left us
That we can call our own, but our afflictions
as a Merchant, all the Countreys fat,
He wholly does ingross unto himself,
Our Oils he buys at his own price, then sells them
To us, at dearer rates, our Plate and Jewels,
Under a faim'd pretence of publike use
He borrows, which deny'd his instruments force
The Races of our horses he takes from us,
Yet keeps them in our pastures, rapes of Matrons,
And Virgins, are too frequent, never man
Yet thank'd him for a pardon, for Religion,
It is a thing he dreams not of

Jul I have heard,
How true it is, I know not, that he sold
The Bishoprick of *Tarent* to a Jew,
For thirteen thousand Duckets (I, 1, Cam vi, 324-5)

In this same account Comines mentions several names which have been used for the *dramatis personae* Two of them, the Prince of Rosane (p 293), and Cardinal Ascaigne, or Ascanio, as he is sometimes called (pp 297-8), are combined in Ferrand's nephew, Ascanio, who is Prince of Rossana (Cam vi, 341) There are also the Duke of Sesse (p 293), Brissonet (p 298), Ronvere (p 301), and one Camillo Pendolpho (p 295), whose name has provided for two members of the cast

The plot of *The Double Marriage* is furnished by two short short

⁷ Thomas Danett, *The Historie of Philip De Commînes*, p 294 The sum, thirteen thousand, appears in the editions of 1596 and 1601, but is changed to thirty thousand in the edition of 1614 Massinger's use of thirteen thousand seems to be proof that he used one of the earlier editions

stories, as we should call them today, and the setting by a passage in a well-known history. A similar combination of sources is found in *The Knight of Malta*, and it may be that grafting and transplanting of this sort have, so far, prevented the critics from identifying the sources of such plays as *The Maid's Tragedy* and *A Wife For A Month*.

E. M. WAITH

Yale University

THE THIRD TYPE OF ASIDE IN SHAKESPEARE

Previous discussion on the subject¹ seems to assume that stage asides are limited to but two distinct types: (1) the aside exchanged between actors on the stage, and (2) that which is directly addressed to the audience, or, "ad spectatores."² Miss Fenton, for example, emerges from her intensive study of asides in all plays to 1616 with the conclusion that only the two kinds exist.

I believe that practically all sides that were not interchanged by two actors, were spoken to the house, or to the nearest members of it.

The great majority of the more than 800 asides I detect in the basic texts of Shakespeare, admittedly, do belong under one of the two usual classifications.³ But a third distinct group, including nearly ten per cent of the asides in the plays, falls into neither.

On at least seventy-six occasions in twenty of his plays⁴ Shake-

¹ For a fairly recent classification of asides, see S. L. Bethell, *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (Durham, N. C., 1944), pp. 105-106.

² This term is continually used in Doris Fenton, *The Extra-Dramatic Moment in Elizabethan Plays* (Phila., 1930).

³ *Ibid.*, Introduction.

⁴ I count 418 asides interchanged by actors and 317 addressed to the audience.

⁵ For the examples not quoted in this article, see *3 Henry VI* (III, ii, 30, 34-35, and v, vii, 21-25), *1 Henry VI* (III, i, 177, v, iii, 75-76, and 81-82), *Richard III* (I, iii, 111-112, 118-120, 126, 134, 143-144, and III, ii, 121), *Titus Andronicus* (III, i, 189-92, IV, ii, 6, 8-9, 17, and 48), *The Taming of the Shrew* (III, i, 50), *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (II, i, 126, IV, ii, 127-128, v, ii, 18, and v, iv, 32), *Love's Labour's Lost* (IV, iii, 52-54, 58-59, 84, 86, 89-90, 93, and 97-98), *Henry V* (III, ii, 110-111), *Julius Caesar* (II, ii, 124-125 and 128-129), *As You Like It* (III, v, 68-70), *Twelfth Night* (III, iv,

speare has an actor give an aside which is addressed neither to any of the other actors on the stage with him nor to members of the audience in the playhouse. All of these asides appear to be aimed at, rather than addressed to, another character on stage⁶—and the words are evidently not intended for his ears or any other character's. The audience hears them, to be sure, but such asides are apparently not addressed to the house either. An example occurs in *Antony and Cleopatra* (II, VII, 87-88) immediately after Menas has been rebuffed by Pompey for suggesting the murder of the triumvirate at sea. Menas assuredly does not intend his general, Pompey, to hear this aside:

For this,
I'll never follow thy pall'd fortunes more.⁷

and it would only create confusion to address such words directly to the audience with Pompey still in sight, as well as within ear-shot. The fact that Pompey is still on the open stage with the speaker prevents these two lines from having the effect of an apostrophe.⁸ Menas aims an aside at Pompey, but it is not intended for his ears or, as evident in the wording, for the ears of any other character. In like manner, if Aufidius intended this aside, aimed at Coriolanus, for the hearing of another character

318-319), *Troilus and Cressida* (V, II, 33, 45-46, 65, 75, 95-96, 102-103, and V, IV, 25-27), *All's Well That Ends Well* (II, III, 105-108, IV, I, 35-36, 53, 56, 59, 62, 64-65, and 68), *Othello* (II, I, 202-204, III, III, 330-333, IV, I, 121-122, 130 and 146-147), *Timon of Athens* (I, II, 113-114, V, I, 32-33, 39-42, and 50), *Cymbeline* (I, II, 16-17, 21-22, 24-26, I, V, 31-32, II, I, 25-26, and II, III, 82-84), *The Winter's Tale* (I, II, 125-126, IV, IV, 652-653, and 726), and *The Tempest* (I, II, 438-440, 447-449, II, I, 327, III, I, 31-32, and III, III, 34-36).

⁶ The sole exceptions are the two occasions on which Suffolk talks to himself (I *Henry VI*, V, III, 75-76 and 81-82). I list them as asides, in note 5 above, because Margaret, who stands beside Suffolk the while, does not hear his words.

⁷ Quotations are from G. L. Kittredge, ed., *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (1936).

⁸ The Shakespearean apostrophe, as shown in a previous article of mine (*SAB*, XXIII, 195-200), is always addressed either to abstractions, inanimate objects, or characters supposed to be incapable of hearing the words because they are not on stage or because they are dead. Pompey, of course, fits into none of these categories.

I am glad thou hast set thy mercy and thy honour
 At difference in thee Out of that I'll work
 Myself a former fortune (*Coriolanus*, v, iii, 200-202)⁹

he would in effect be committing suicide, for standing on the stage near him at the time are Coriolanus himself, Volumnia, Virgilia, Valeria, and young Marcus, any one of whom would be expected by the audience to use Aufidius' words against him on the spot. Shakespeare, of course, uses this neat device as a method of foreshadowing for the sake of his audience, but such an aside could not have been said directly "ad spectatores." Still more surely did the actor playing the part of "Second Lord" in *Cymbeline* intend to address his aside directly to no one.

You are a fool granted, therefore your
 issues, being foolish, do not derogate (II, 1, 50-52)

If he allowed Cloten, against whom the aside is directed, to hear these words his career as a Lord would be expected to end suddenly. On the other hand, if he gave them squarely to the audience some slow-witted but muscular groundling might readily take offence at being called "fool" and shorten his career as an actor by vaulting the stage rail as "Lucifer" claims to have done in Middleton's *Black Book* in 1604.¹⁰

From the wording of such asides it would seem that while delivering his speech of condemnation¹¹ the speaker probably faced toward the character on stage against whom they were aimed. To prevent the audience from assuming the aside to be the more usual exchange between actors, the deliverer could have changed the tone of his voice, but even without such an expedient the spectators would surely have known from the target's total lack of reaction to the words that he was not supposed to be aware of the aside. An excellent illustration of what the stage business was probably like

⁹ Kittredge, *ed cit*, marks Aufidius' speech as an aside, though he fails to mark Menas' lines, quoted above, as such.

¹⁰ For the oft-quoted allusion, see A. H. Bullen, ed., *The Works of Thomas Middleton* (8v, London 1886), VIII, 8. Lucifer's words are

" . . . And now that I have vaulted up so high
 Above the stage-rails of this earthen globe,
 I must turn actor and join companies, " "

¹¹ Most asides of this type are derogatory in their wording, many being outright threats.

is offered by the well known aside which Iago aims at Cassio (*Othello*, II, 1, 168-178), the very wording of which assures us that Cassio is too preoccupied with courteous attendance on Desdemona the while to detect, and thereby react to, Iago's threats

He takes her by the palm Ay, well said, whisper! With as little a web as this will I ensnare as great a fly as Cassio Ay, smile upon her, do! I will gyve thee in thine own countship You say true, 'tis so, indeed! If such tricks as these strip you out of your lieutenantry, it had been better you had not kiss'd your three fingers so oft—which now again you are most apt to play the sir in Very good! well kiss'd! an excellent curtsy! 'Tis so, indeed Yet again your fingers to your lips? Would they were clyster pipes for your sake!

Though it is possible Iago risked turning to the audience (surely not to Rodrigo!) for the delivery of a few of his words, certainly for most of the speech he must have been obliged to look across the stage squarely at Cassio, in order to determine so accurately what the lieutenant and Desdemona were doing, as well as to give his words their most telling dramatic effect.

WARREN SMITH

Rhode Island State College

THE PEDANT AND CHURCH IN *TWELFTH NIGHT*, III. 11 80

No edition of Shakespeare's works, it seems, gives a satisfactory explanation of Maria's reference to the cross-gartered Malvolio looking "like a pedant that keeps a school i' th' church" (*Twelfth Night*, III. 11 80) Although the *Variorum* quoting Halliwell discounts the probability of there being a local allusion here, it seems much more likely that Shakespeare had a particular local pedant and church in mind and the Elizabethan audience would have been sure to catch the allusion

It was no novelty in Shakespeare's day for schools to be kept in connection with various churches With the suppression of religious houses by Henry VIII and the founding of an increasing number of public and private grammar schools, church schools had fallen into decay However, as a consequence of the great Protestant refugee immigration under Elizabeth some of the church schools were re-

vived, and particularly the schools of the churches for foreigners. The French Church in Threadneedle Street had a well-known church school in Shakespeare's time, and a refugee schoolmaster by the name of Paul Le Pipre was there at least until 1597 and probably later.¹ Christopher Montjoy, in whose house Shakespeare lived for a time, and his son-in-law Stephen Bellott were members of this French Church. Their lawsuit to which Shakespeare was a witness was referred to the Consistory of this church in 1612.²

The best known center of school teaching in London, however, was St Paul's Churchyard. This was the very heart of city life, and many famous language teachers and manual writers such as Claudius Holyband, G de la Mothe, and William Stepney had their schools here. These teachers did not fail to advertise their schools in their dialogue books. Stepney, for example, in his *Spanish Schole-master* (1591) speaks of his classes being held "in the Church of Saint Paule."³ Shakespeare, then, in his allusion to "a school i' th' church" was most likely referring to one of these popular schools held in the churchyard of the most famous of London churches.

This suggestion is further strengthened by the allusion to the pedant, who must have been a familiar figure to Elizabethans in his gaudy stockings and cross-garters. Cross-gartering—gartering above and below the knee—was the height of fashion at one time, but the style had so declined by 1600 that cross-garters were worn chiefly by old men, Puritans, pedants, and servants.⁴ A Protestant refugee teacher would have been the very one to be backward or eccentric in fashion, and especially, to stick to a style that was an importation from abroad.

Just who the pedant was that Shakespeare had in mind we shall never know. But when we consider the passage in question in the

¹ Kathleen Lambley, *The Teaching and Cultivation of the French Language in England during Tudor and Stuart Times* (Manchester, 1920), p. 149.

² C. W. Wallace, "New Shakespeare Discoveries," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, cxx (1910), 507, and "Shakespeare and his London Associates as Revealed in Recently Discovered Documents," *University of Nebraska Studies*, x, no. 4 (Lincoln, 1910), pp. 39-41.

³ Francis A. Yates, *John Florio: The Life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge, 1934), p. 145.

⁴ M. Channing Linthicum, *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Oxford, 1936), p. 264.

light of the fashions of the time and the renown of St. Paul's Churchyard as a school center, we do come closer to the local allusion that Shakespeare's audience easily understood. Moreover, the fact that Shakespeare's other pedants—Holofernes, Sir Hugh Evans, and Cambio—were all foreigners makes it even more likely that "a pedant that keeps a school i' th' church" was a certain refugee schoolmaster at St. Paul's.

R. C. SIMONINI, JR

Washington College

POMPEY AS THE MYTHICAL LOVER OF CLEOPATRA

In *ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA*, Shakespeare refers twice to the "great Pompey" as the lover of Cleopatra

and great Pompey

Would stand and make his eyes grow in my brow,

There would he anchor his aspect, and die

With looking on his life (I v 31-34)

and

I found you as a morsel cold upon

Dead Caesar's trencher Nay, you were a fragment

Of Gneus Pompey's (III xiii 116-118)

But the source of Shakespeare's information—Sir Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's *Lives*—is quite different the lover is the "sonne" of Pompey the Great

Cleopatra gessing by the former accesse and credit she had with Julius Caesar, and Cneus Pompey (the sonne of Pompey the great) only for her beawtie she began to have good hope that she might more easely win Antonius For Caesar and Pompey knew her when she was but a young thing¹

Shakespearean scholars seem to have overlooked this discrepancy between Plutarch and Shakespeare. Those who have made comments on Pompey as Cleopatra's lover have unwittingly accepted their maestro's version as authentic history. Mr. George Lyman Kittredge's view is typical of a number of distinguished critics. "Three successive rulers of the (Roman) empire," he concludes after analyzing the play and reviewing the historical criticism of it,

¹ Edition of 1579

"had Cleopatra enchanted—Pompey and Julius Caesar and Mark Antony"²

A quick glance at history will show that Pompey the Great could have had no relations with Cleopatra, for his career had reached its zenith while she "was but a young thing" He marched past Egypt on his great triumphal return to Rome in 62 B C when Cleopatra was but six or seven years of age (she was born in 69 B C) Thereafter, Pompey was occupied with civil wars at home and saw Egypt again only when he fled there to escape Caesar and was treacherously killed as he stepped ashore

Shakespeare, in the hurried sweep of his imagination, undoubtedly misread Plutarch's remark about the "sonne of Pompey the great" But further investigation makes it dubious that even the "sonne" was involved with Cleopatra Plutarch, as is well known, sometimes shaped history to fit his own opinions and often recorded events merely from memory Roman historians do not mention Pompey's eldest son, Gneius, as having figured in Cleopatra's life According to Appian in *De bello civili*, the son Gneius was an undistinguished man who commanded his father's Adriatic fleet (part of which had been recruited by him in Alexandria after Cleopatra had been driven from the throne), but fled with the family after the battle of Pharsalia, and was killed in Spain after a few abortive skirmishes with Caesar's troops Professor J P Mahaffy, in his *Empire of the Ptolemies*, concludes that the story about the son of Pompey and Cleopatra was easy to invent and that "the gossip about Gneius Pompey is probably groundless"³

WAINO S. NYLAND

University of Colorado

² Kittredge's edition of *Antony and Cleopatra*, xi Some of the others who make the same false assumption are M W MacCallum *Shakespeare's Roman Plays*, p. 415, Edward Dowden and Walter Scott, *New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*, p. 503, L L Schucking, *Character Problems In Shakespeare's Plays*, p. 124, Martin Ellehauge, *Engelsche Studien* 65, 207 Even the editors of the *New Variorum Edition* fail to clarify the discrepancy

³ P. 497

THOMAS DEKKER, ROBERT WILSON, AND
THE SHOEMAKERS HOLIDAY

A century ago an anonymous writer signing himself "Dramaticus" printed a description of a copy, owned by a friend, of the 1600 quarto of *The Shoemakers Holiday* in which an allegedly contemporaneous hand had written the names *T. Dekker* and *R. Wilson* following the printed address to the reader.¹ Within the body of the text this same hand had added the name of the actor in the margin opposite the first entrance of each character "Dramaticus" discusses this actor list and writes a series of notes identifying the different members. He also points out the importance of this authoritative attribution of authorship for an anonymous play of great merit, with a demonstration of the neat manner in which the dual attribution coincides with the fragmentary reference to the play in Henslowe's *Diary*. In a postscript, dated thirteen days after the date affixed to the article, he announces he has prevailed on his friend to reprint the quarto, probably at this owner's expense, but if not, he will offer to the Society an accurate copy.

The promised reprint was not made, and the annotated quarto thus described not having come to light, the question of Robert Wilson's connection with *The Shoemakers' Holiday* has rested to the present on the statements made in 1849 by this unidentified writer. The probability of Wilson's collaboration has been variously received, either with considerable credence² or with none at all.³ Sir Edmund Chambers represents what is perhaps the troubled middle of most scholarly opinion, on the whole inclined to disbelieve yet not entirely easy at rejecting out of hand such reported evidence when the original document has not been available for testing as a forgery.⁴

This ghost may now be laid by the discovery in the Houghton

¹ "The Players who acted in *The Shoemakers' Holiday*, 1600, a Comedy by Thomas Dekker and Robert Wilson," *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iv (1849), 110-122.

² Ernest Rhys, ed., *Thomas Dekker* (Mermaid Series), p. 2.

³ W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary* (1908), II, 203. "The list of actors communicated by 'Dramaticus' is an obvious forgery, and a very clumsy one." In his *Dictionary of Actors* (1929), p. 288, Nungezer quotes this statement without further discussion.

⁴ *The Elizabethan Stage* (1923), III, 292. "Fleay and Greg unite in condemning this communication as an obvious forgery, but I rather wish they had given their reasons."

Library of Harvard University of the annotated quarto of 1600 on which "Dramaticus" based his article. As reported, the address is followed by the names of Dekker and Wilson, and the actors are noted at the first entrance of the various characters as listed in 1849, but with one exception to be noted presently. Interestingly enough, the title-page contains the autograph of J. Payne Collier. At the back of the volume, now elaborately cased in leather, is found a sheet of paper containing in Collier's own hand a list of the characters and the actors as given in 1849 except that here they are arranged in the order of entrance. Also bound at the back is a clipping headed in Collier's hand "Ath^m. 10 Jan., 1863" containing an anonymous printed review (which must have been by Collier) of Fritsche's edition of the play. This review puts forward Wilson as an established collaborator, and scolds Fritsche for not having observed the Shakespeare Society article in 1849. After rightfully criticizing Fritsche for using the third edition of 1618 as a basis for the reprint, the reviewer suggests a number of emendations, some of which are found, with various others not mentioned, in the form of pencil notes scattered through the Houghton quarto. The review contains the information (possibly untrustworthy) that in 1849 the Society was proposing to reprint the play from the proper text of 1600, but that the project did not materialize.

A close examination of the supposedly early handwriting in the quarto exposes several slips of the pen which make it unlikely that the writing is genuine.⁵ In addition, there is a piece of evidence which backs up the suspicion thrown on the handwriting. Both the "Dramaticus" article and the Collier list found at the end of the quarto name the actor Price for the character Scott, yet in the margin of the text Scott is the only character against whose entrance no actor's name is written. At a minimum, therefore, Collier-Dramaticus must have created this actor in the part of Scott out of his imagination, and it is certainly plausible that the Shakespeare Society article was drawn up from his own list as bound at the end.⁶

⁵ I am indebted to Dr. Giles E. Dawson of the Folger Shakespeare Library and to Dr. William H. Bond of the Houghton Library for their concurring opinion that the annotations are not genuine and that they bear a kind of resemblance to the hand of known Collier forgeries.

⁶ Amusingly, "Dramaticus" identifies Price by remarking that Collier in his *History of English Dramatic Poetry* has misprinted his name as *Pryore* among Prince Henry's retainers. Twice in the article "Dramaticus" emphasizes that he has transcribed the names precisely as they stand in the quarto, and this is true for Downton, who is *Dowton* in the quarto and

Now that the "Dramaticus" quarto is identified and can be related to Collier by his autograph on the title as well as by the bound-in holograph material,⁷ we may confidently reject the actor list (some parts of which are fantastic, as was recognized by Fleay and Greg), and also the Robert Wilson attribution, as typical Collier forgeries, this rejection supported by the evidence of the handwriting itself.

The motive for this set of forgeries is plain, at least in part. Collier, who owned a copy of the 1600 quarto (the friend is clearly a pleasant fiction), and who was justly impatient with such false attributions of authorship as that advanced for Barton Holiday, seems to have set his mind on editing the text, and forged the entries partly no doubt to aid in his private reconstruction of Elizabethan stage history but also in part as an attempt to set a unique value on this quarto and thus to induce the Society to publish it. The various pencil notes indicate an interest in emending the text (as indicated later by his review of Fritzsche) and also some study of the problems since he is aware of Malone's masterly emendation of 'beckons' for 'becomes'. The means Collier used were regrettable, of course, and have created a considerable amount of confusion in this case. But the harm having been done, it is rather a pity that the Society did not rise to the bait and print his proposed edition, for his text, based on the first quarto, would have been much superior to Fritzsche's and certainly the equal of Shepherd's in the Pearson reprint of Dekker.

FREDSON BOWERS

The University of Virginia

in the article but *Downton* in Collier's list. On the other hand, the article and the list agree on the spelling *Massy* although the quarto annotation is *Massie*, similarly, list and article agree on *Jewby* and *Jones* although the quarto reads *Jewbie* and *Ihones*. Such evidence might suggest that the forged entries in the quarto were made later than the list but before the writing of the article. On the other hand, the absence of Price's name opposite Scott's entrance may have been a simple oversight, but the peculiar circumstances of the Price-Pryor equation suggest that the forged annotations came first and that some trouble developed over the naming of an actor for the part of Scott until Collier seized on the opportunity to correct himself. For the possible confusion of Price and Pryor, see Nungezer, *op cit*, p. 238.

⁷ This identification is useful as demonstrating what may often have been suspected—that the various contributions by "Dramaticus" to the *Shakespeare Society's Papers* are from Collier's pen.

THE BODY AS A TRIANGULAR STRUCTURE IN SPENSER AND CHAPMAN

Critics have debated whether Spenser's use of the triangle and circle in his description of the Castle of Alma should be regarded symbolically, as referring to the body and the soul or intellect, or literally, as describing the human trunk and the head.¹ An apparently unnoticed passage in the *Hymnus in Cynthiam* of Chapman's *The Shadow of Night*, 1594, published four years after the first installment of *The Faerie Queene*, seems to uphold the former viewpoint which is the earlier, since Sir Kenelm Digby expounds it. Here is the perplexing stanza which he undertook to explain

The frame thereof seemd partly circulare,
And part triangulare, O worke diuine,
Those two the first and last proportions are,
The one imperfect, mortall, fœminine,
Th'other immortall, perfect, masculine,
And twixt them both a quadrate was the base,
Proportioned equally by seuen and nine,
Nine was the circle set in heauens place,
All which compacted made a goodly diapase (II, ix, 22)

Chapman's Cynthia represents most notably, among other things, "the forces of the mind."² But she is also "Natures bright eyesight" because, "by her store of humors, issue is giuen to all birth and thereof is she called *Lucina*,"³ and she is the mistress of Form whom she commands to build on earth "Her rare Elisian Pallace":

Forme then, twixt two superior pillars framd
This tender building, Pax Imperij nam'd,
Which cast a shadow, like a Pyramis
Whose basis, in the plaine or back part is
Of that quaint worke the top so high extended,
That it the region of the Moone transcended
Without, and within it, euerie corner filld
By bewtious Forme, as her great mistresse wild

(188 95)

¹ See the Variorum Spenser, II, Appendix XI

² *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed P B Bartlett (New York, 1941), *Hymnus in Cynthiam*, 153

³ *Ibid.*, 1 and gloss, cf *The Faerie Queene*, III, vi, 9, 15 Chapman might have had in mind a counterpart of Spenser's Venus and Adonis myth from which Diana is withdrawn

Chapman's Palace is surely meant to be triangular, it casts a pyramidal shadow, and its base is in the "plaine" or horizontal part, the "back," as distinct from the two sides, of the triangle. The shadow probably denotes transitoriness. But there is no circle at the apex, Cynthia, who is to inhabit the Palace, is "the forces of the mind," and her symbol of the rounded moon (the region of which is transcended) might be regarded as the equivalent of Spenser's circle. Such an equation is made in the opening lines of the poem ⁴

Though the fact has been overlooked, there can be no doubt that Chapman intends a representation of the human body ⁵ What he found wanting in Spenser's allegorical triangle was not a head, but legs. The "tender building" is set up "twixt two superior pillars", supporting it, the function of pillars, it rises over the space between them. Spenser writes of Belpheobe's "streight legs" "Like two faire marble pillours they were seene, Which doe the temple of the Gods support," and similar descriptions appear elsewhere ⁶ Chapman himself supplies an excellent commentary in *All Fools*, 1605, written perhaps in 1599, it is not clear whether this Egyptian temple is a pyramid

Brother, I read that Egypt heretofore
Had temples of the riches[t] frame on earth,
Much like this goodly edifice of women,
With alabaster pillars were those temples
Upheld and beautified, and so are women

Furthermore, with his personification of Form who fills every part of the Palace she builds, the bones of Chapman's allegory, as well as of his philosophy, protrude rather obviously. Whatever neo-Platonic material he uses, here he is relying on a familiar and fundamental Aristotelian concept—that man is composite, compounded of prime matter and substantial form, of potency and act

⁴ See 6-9, on the circle here Bartlett cites *The Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 22. In *Ovid's Banquet of Sense*, 1595, a pyramid, chapter, and base appear in another context, 64, 1-4.

⁵ The Palace is built "Of flowrs, and shadows, mists, and meteors," apparently referring to the humours and elements, see 173-5, 210-11, 220-22.

⁶ *Faerie Queene*, II, iii, 28, 1-4. See also Chapman's "The Amorous Zodiac," 1595, 27, 5-6, & Fletcher's *Christ's Victory and Triumph*, 1610, II, 13.

⁷ *All Fools*, I, 1, 80-4, in *The Comedies of George Chapman*, ed. T. M. Parrott (London, [1914]), see his note on the passage.

In summary, then, shortly after the appearance of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Chapman refers to a Palace of the body in the striking terms of triangle and base, Spenser's circle apparently he accepts as symbolic of the intellect, which he personifies in Cynthia, and it is not a part of his structure. In this he agrees with Digby and not with the interpretation initiated by Morley.

RICHARD H. PERKINSON

St Louis, Mo

DANIEL SKINNER, LORD PRESTON, AND MILTON'S COMMONPLACE BOOK

In 1874, A. J. Horwood announced his discovery of Milton's Commonplace Book at Netherby Hall, Longtown, Cumberland, among the papers of Sir Richard Graham (1648-1695), Viscount Preston, and Envoy Extraordinary to the Court of France. Since Horwood¹ could find no evidence of Sir Richard's acquaintance with Milton, he suggested that Lord Preston had received the volume from Daniel Skinner, a former schoolmate of Sir Richard and an acquaintance of Milton during the poet's last years. To support this suggestion, Horwood offered the evidence of two letters of Skinner to Lord Preston in 1682, and argued that Skinner, who had several Milton MSS in his possession, had presented the Commonplace Book to Lord Preston, probably as a bribe to secure employment under him in Paris.

Although Miltonists have generally accepted Horwood's suggestion, their knowledge of the two letters upon which it was based has been limited to Horwood's brief summary of them in the *Seventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*,² issued some seventy years ago. Through the kindness of their present possessor, Sir Fergus Graham, I am permitted to print the full text of the two letters, and thus not only to present the evidence upon which Horwood based his suggestion, but also to add to our knowledge of Skinner, the most colorful of the known amanuenses of Milton.³

¹ *A Common-Place Book of John Milton*, The Camden Society, n. s. xvi (Westminster, 1876), p. xix-xx.

² Pt. I (1878-79), p. 380.

³ Extended discussion of Skinner's career appears in *PMLA*, lv (1940),

The first letter bears two endorsements, "L^{rs} from several persons, Feb Apr May 1682" and "Febr 4^o/82 S N. Mr Skinner from Paris," and is addressed, in Skinner's hand, "A Son Excellence My Lord Preston nommé par Le Roy de La Grande Bretagne pour estre Son Ambassadeur á la cour de France A Londres." The text,⁴ also in Skinner's hand, runs as follows

Monseigneur

Le souvenir que J'ay d'avoir l'honneur de commencer [m]es estudes avec Vostre Excellence á la fameuse e[c]ole de Westminster, me fait prendre la liberté de vous expedier mes compliments sur la preference que le Roy de la Grande Bretagne a faite de Vostre personne pour estre Son Ambassadeur á la cour de France une cour en effet qui tient pour une espèce de gloire qu'on

102-18 To it, in addition to these two letters, may be added the following Latin verses written by Skinner and published in *Epicedia Cantabrigiensia in Obitum Illustrissimæ Principis Annæ Ducissæ Eboracensis*, Cambridge, 1671, leaf K

Ad Ducem EBORACENSEM

Post tot fata Tuæ, *Dux* magne, propaginis, & tot
 Busta, satis saturam credimus esse necem
 At velut Hydra, novos parit ingeminata dolores,
 Savire in vestram sic juvat usque domum
 Fletibus ut Conjux Tua cæsa indulget, in anno
 Nos ridere semel *Dux*, ut Apollo, fines
 Cum tædam accensam lætus (gaudere licebit)
 Vibrat Hymen, quatit ut jam Libitina facem

D Skinner, Trin Coll

⁴My transcript, from which these letters are printed, was made at Netherby Hall in July, 1948, and since I have not been able to recheck it with the originals or with photographs, the texts must be considered as provisional and subject to later correction. In content the letters show that combination of wheedling flattery and forwardness which Skinner used so successfully on Samuel Pepys (who loaned him £10) and on Sir Joseph Williamson (who gave him a position as clerk), and yet gained for him the contemporary epithets of "a very pretty" but "bold young man." In the first letter, Skinner's claim to "une longue habitude" in France and to "une parfaite connoissance" of French must be received with caution. In November, 1676, Williamson indicated that Skinner did not have French "perfectly," and Skinner's two sojourns in France were not, so far as we can determine, long. The first consisted of apparently not over several months early in 1677, and the second of probably not over a year in 1680-81. In the second letter, the circumstances that lie behind it are not clearly set forth, but the letter itself suggests that Lord Preston, like Pepys and Williamson, found that Skinner did not live up to expectations, and that he was, as William Howe found him, "something soft in his disposition."

luy envoie des ministres dont la sagesse le merite et la vertu est aussy eclatante come la Vostre en un mot il semble icy que le Roy d'angleterre n'a fait un choix si judicieux que pour apprendre au roy de france d' en agir de mesme Si par quelque bonheur Vostre Excellence pourroit me remettre dans son esprit, Elle trouveroit que ce petit mot de complymnt ne luy est présenté que pour l'asseurer de mes tres profonds respects, et a mesme temps comme une longue habitude dans ce pays cy m' a donné une parfaite connoissan[c]e de son langage et de la maniere que l'on se gouverne en cette cour, Vostre Excellence ne trouvera pas desagreceable que Je luy fasse offre de mes services avec de grandissimes assurances de pouvoir luy estre fort utile Si J'en suis jugé capable, Je m' estimeray fort heureux de obeer aux ordres d' une personne avec qui comme avec plusieurs autres les plus grands genies d'angleterre J'ay tiré les premiers commencements de mon education du reste Monseigneur ce sera une forte application á tout ce qui pourra regarder le ministere de Vostre Excellence, dont Je me feray gloire de luy donner de si puissantes marques qu' Elle demeurera necessairement tres satisfaite de la passion et de la soumission avec laquelle Je pretends estre

Monseigneur

Paris Fevrier 4 1682

Vostre tres humble

stylo novo

et

Si Vostre Excellence me croit

tres obeissant serviteur

propre a recevoir ses ordres Elle

Dan Skinner

aura la bonté S'il luy plait de me les

envoyer a Paris, dont J'auray un soin

tout particulier en attendant son arrivee pour

avoir l'honneur de luy faire la reverence en personne

The second letter is endorsed "Mr Skinner Paris Novr 19th 82," and is addressed "A Monseigneur Le Vicomte de Preston Envoyé Extraordinaire du Roy de la Grande Bretagne A Paris" The seal on this letter is different from that found on the first, and the address, text, and signature of the letter is in a hand totally different from that elsewhere attributed to Skinner

Monseigneur

Voicy la seconde fois que je m' adresse a vótre Excellence en françois La premiere estoit pour vous faire offre de mon service en cas que vous en eussiez besoin Celle est pour vous remercier tres humblement de toutes les bontés qu'il vous a plú avoir pour moy quoyque dechu de toutes mes esperances, Neantmoins je ne laisseras de vous avoir les mesmes obligations, comme si tous mes projets eussent esté suivis d'un heureux succès La place qu'il vous a plú m'accorder dans vostre estime devroit m'en consoler et me faire demeurer dans un silence respectueux fort content des honneurs que vous m'avez deja faits Mais Monseigneur il m'est tres difficile a garder le silence lors qu'il y á de sy fortes raisons qui me pous-sent a parler, et comme la plume m'a tousjours esté plus hardie que la

parole, trouvez agreable Monseigneur que je m'en serve Il est tres Constant que les choses que lon souhaite le plus sont celles qui arrivent le moins Car avec quelle passion nay-je pas desire de vous estre necessaire dans l' accablement de vos affaires, avec quelle patience ne me suis je pas tenu si long temps a Paris dans une plaine esperance d y entrer ils Cependant par malheur pour moy tous mes efforts n'ont eu que de la fumee pour effect d' estre incommode Monseigneur C'est un de mes plus grands suplices pendant que plusieurs croyent meriter vos bonnes graces à cause qu'ils sont hardis, si je ne vous ay pas fait ma cour si librement C'est le trop profond respect et la crainte de passer pour effronté qui m'en ont empesche, je me suis crû assés honoré de vos promesses, et me suis contenté des assurances de vótre amite que vous m'avez donnez sans avoir force par des visites importunes votre genereuse inclination a me les tenir Ce n'est pas pour vous reprocher en aucune facon du monde Monsiegnieur le peu de souvenir de votre parole Mais J' aprehende seulement que quelqu'un n'ait malicieusement detourné le penchant que vous avez a me vouloir du bien Quoy qu'il en soit Mons.eigneur souffrez s'il vous plaist que je vous fasse ressouvenir que vous m'avez genereusement et volontairement promis l'honneur de vostre amitié, et mesme il y auroit de la folie en moy de la refuser Principalement quand lestat ou sont presentement mes affaires m'oblige a vous prendre au mot, et a embrasser la premiere occasion qui parroit par vostre entremise se presenter La seule grace donc que je vous demande Monsiegnieur est une audience d'un quart d'heure en particulier, dans laquelle je tacheray de vous faire voir (encore que je n'aye pas toutes les qualités requises pour pouvoir meriter l'honneur de vostre amite comme je le voudrois bien) que personne au monde n'est avec plus de zeile plus d'affection ny plus de respect que moy qui suis

Monsiegnieur
Vostre tres humble
et tres obeissant serviteur
D Skinner

De paris ce Jeudy 19
nov 1682

MAURICE KELLEY

Princeton University

MILTON'S "AERIE MICROSCOPE"

In Book IV of *Paradise Regained*, Satan shows Christ the city of Rome in all its particulars, despite the intervening mountains, and Milton comments:

By what strange Parallax or Optic skill
Of vision multiplied through air, or glass
Of Telescope, were curious to enquire

(40-42)

Satan promises a little later to reveal even more

Many a fair Edifice besides, more like
Houses of Gods (so well I have dispos'd
My Aerie Microscope) thou may'st behold
Outside and inside both, pillais and roofes
Carv'd work, the hand of fam'd Artificers
In Cedar, Marble, Ivory or Gold

(55-60)

In none of the editions of *Paradise Regained* are these lines satisfactorily explained or illustrated. One recent critic concludes that Milton knew of the traditional explanations of how Satan showed Christ all the kingdoms of the world at once, but that he was uninterested in more than a vague treatment of the method.¹ The peculiar features of the second crux were pointed up some years ago by Marjorie Nicolson, whose comment suggests the most reasonable interpretation to date

I am inclined to believe that either he was using the word [microscope] loosely, which would be remarkable at this time, or that from vague accounts of the new instrument, he misunderstood its function. In the passage in question, he seems to be suggesting a combination of a telescope and some supposed instrument which would show *interiors* as well as exteriors, since Satan says that by this means Christ may behold 'Outside and inside both'.²

It is possible to suggest a gloss on the two passages which describes just such a combination. Chapter 21 of the first book of Leonard and Thomas Digges' *A Geometrical Practicall Treatize Named Pantometria* tells of a system of lens arrangement ("vision multiplyed through air") by which are produced precisely the effects set forth in the two cruxes

By these kinde of Glasses or rather frames of them, placed in due Angles, yee may not onely set out the proportion of an whole region, yea represent before your eye the luely image of euery Towne, Village, &c and that in as little or great space or place as ye will prescribe, but also augment and dilate any parcell thereof, so that whereas at the first appearance an whole Towne shall present it selfe so small and compact together that yee shall not discerne anye difference of streates, yee may by application of Glasses in due proportion cause any peculiare house, or rounge thereof dilate and shew it selfe in as ample forme as the whole towne first appeared, so that ye shall discerne any trifle, or reade any letter lying there

¹ Elizabeth Marie Pope, *Paradise Regained the Tradition and the Poem* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1947), pp. 112-114.

² "Milton and the Telescope," *ELH*, II (1935), p. 11 and note.

open, especially if the sunne beames may come vnto it, as plainly as if you were corporally present, although it be distante from you as farre as eye can deserie²

Whether Milton knew and, had in mind the passage from *Pantometria* when he wrote *Paradise Regained* is, like so much source study of Milton, highly debatable. But the existence of this precedent for his device confirms once again the need for minute exploration of the scientific literature of the Renaissance if we are to understand his poetry.

KESTER SVENDSEN

The University of Oklahoma

MILTON AND LEE'S *THE RIVAL QUEENS* (1677)

Some years ago Professor R. D. Havens drew attention to what he describes as a "very early and striking borrowing" from *Paradise Lost* in Nathaniel Lee's *Caesar Borgia* (1679)¹ I should like to point out another, earlier borrowing from Milton's poem in Lee's *The Rival Queens* (1677) Here the general conception of the villain Cassander, a character type essentially new to Lee, suggests some influence of Milton's Satan (or Dryden's Lucifer), but a definite connection with Milton is established when Cassander, in soliloquy, says

Oh, 'tis the worst of Racks to a brave Spirit,
To be born Base, a Vassal, a curs'd Slave,
Now by the Project lab'ring in my Brain,
'Tis nobler far to be a King in Hell,
To head infernal Legions, Chiefs below,
To let 'em loose for Earth, to call 'em in,
And take account of what dark Deeds are done,
Than be a Subject God in Heav'n unblest,
And without Mischief have eternal Rest²

² London, 1591, p. 28 Italics mine

¹ *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry* (1922), p. 14 n. See *Caesar Borgia*, Act V (*Dramatick Works*, 1734, II, 93-94) and *Paradise Lost*, III, 487-496. The borrowed passage is completely independent of Dryden's *State of Innocence*.

² *The Rival Queens*, Act IV (*Dramatick Works*, 1734, III, 261-262). Compare *Paradise Lost*, I, 261-263, II, 237-257. Dryden in *The State of Inno-*

This borrowing, the first sure evidence of Miltonic influence that I have found in Lee, raises a question of some interest. It will be recalled that in the same year in which *The Rival Queens* appeared Lee also contributed a set of commendatory verses to Dryden's *State of Innocence* (1677), which, though it contains much more of compliment than criticism, at least suggests that Lee had by then actually compared Milton's poem and Dryden's adaptation.³ In view of the coincidence of dates between what seems to be Lee's first borrowing from Milton and his verses to Dryden, it is not uncritical perhaps to suggest that Lee was introduced to Milton's poem through the medium of Dryden's "abortive opera." Yet significantly, despite Lee's fulsome preference for what he calls Dryden's "Poem of Paradise," it is Milton not Dryden whom Lee remembers.

G. BLAKEMORE EVANS

University of Illinois

A NOTE ON THE DATE OF A DRYDEN LETTER

Professor Ward's edition of Dryden's letters¹ dates a letter of the poet's to William Walsh [Letter 25]² August 17, 1693.³ This date and the date of the subsequent one [Letter 26],⁴ August 30, 1693, raise certain difficulties when the information contained in the two letters is compared. It is in attempt to resolve these difficulties that the present paper is undertaken, and it is the opinion of the writer that the date of the earlier letter should be July 20, 1693, and not August 17th.

cence makes use of the first of these Miltonic passages, but the suggestion of boredom in the last lines of Lee's verses is found only in Milton.

³ Any exact dating of Lee's verses is complicated by the length of time in which *The State of Innocence* lay in manuscript, having been finished in 1673 or 1674, entered at Stationers' Hall on April 17, 1674, but not printed until 1677. It seems likely, however, that Lee's verses were written only after Dryden had decided to publish, a decision which, if we may trust Dryden, was at long last forced on him by the large number of unauthorized manuscript copies by then in circulation. But the circumstances behind the late publication of *The State of Innocence* are far from clear.

¹ *The Letters of John Dryden*, ed. by Charles E. Ward (Durham, Duke University Press, 1942).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 56-7.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 58-9.

For purposes of reference the text of the letter in question is reproduced here

My Friend

Yesterday morning my Lord Lyncester sent his Gentleman to me, to let you know by me, that he had made enquiry about the place you mentioned, & found that some dayes before your letter came, it had been given away to one Mr Carey, who had possest it in the time of K Charles the 2d and that this Gentleman was actually sworn into it I suppose that you imagind the place of that benefit, being now worth 1500th y annum, wou'd not be long voyd & therefore set not your heart upon it I spoke for places in the coach too late, there will be none voyd till next weeke Tonson has likewise fayld me in the publishing his Miscellanyes Tho that shou'd not have hindered me any longer [than?] till Saturday I thinke I gave you an account of all things in your letter onely forgot, perhaps, one thing w^{ch} is you desird to know what kind of Book it was y^t Hen Herringman or his man publisht under the name of Miscellany-Poems they are almost all old, as I am informd, & have been most of them printed before One or two of My Lord Roscomons excepted No body vallues them, nor woud you, yourselfe, as my Friends tell me I gave your service to Congreve, who is since gone out of Town for a moneth or six weekes No newes, I thinke that of the Ships is at a stand We have lost about forty or fifty, including the Dutch Merchants de Tourvilles letter to his King sayes he has destroyd Seaven Dutch & English men of warr, & that he is still in pursuit of merchants ships Huy, I thinke I told you is taken, & so is Darmstead neere Francfort the Dauphin & Lorge are gone to find Louis of Baden, who is not above 24 thousand strong Saxony will not joine him, unless he may command & in probability, has taken French money, to lye still The Confederacy totters, for the Emperour is inclind to treat, but France will grant no Cessation in the meane time All things favour the Monarch, who pushes round him & our Fleet yesterday was in Torbay no newes of Rook since his last letter we ghesse him gone for Ireland, with the remainder of his scatterd covey

I am Sir,

Your most Faithfull Servant

John Dryden

Thursday

For William Walsh Esq

Att Abberley neere Worcester

These

To be left at the posthouse in

Worcester, & thence conveyd ^s

If, as Professor Ward suggests, this letter was written on August 17, 1693, there are immediate difficulties when it is taken in con-

nection with the following one, which is dated "Aug 30th" [1693], and is written to Tonson from Clapton Manor in Northamptonshire, where Dryden had gone when he finally obtained his place in the coach. From this letter we learn that Tonson had accompanied Dryden to Tichmarsh, and Dryden begins with an apology for his long delay in writing to thank Tonson for this act of friendship.⁶ He then goes on to say, "I have translated six hunderd lines of Ovid,"⁷ and a little farther on says, "I have been but thrice at Tichmarsh, of which you were with me once"⁸ He adds that about a fortnight ago he received news by letter, news of London, and of a kind that he would certainly have imparted to his bookseller on the journey or before had it been known to him then.⁹

Let us now examine the information in Letter 25. It is dated "Thursday." If it was actually the 17th of August that he wrote, it means that Dryden could not have left London for Tichmarsh until August 21 at the earliest, for he tells us that there were no places in the coach until the next week, so the following Monday would presumably be the earliest he could get off. Letter 64 tells us that it took two days to travel by coach between Tichmarsh and London,¹⁰ which would put Dryden and Tonson in Tichmarsh no earlier than the evening of August 22. Yet the tone of Letter 26 is not compatible with that of one written but eight days after his arrival. His apology would not have been quite so abject, he would not have said "but thrice at Tichmarsh" if he had been there every other day since his arrival of Clapton Manor. Finally, he would not have mentioned a two-week-old letter in those terms.

Professor Ward arrives at his date of August 17, 1693 from the statement contained in Letter 25, "our Fleet yesterday was in Torbay . . .", for the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1693*, records that the fleet dropped anchor in Torbay on August 16.¹¹ However, another interpretation is possible. The *Calendar* quotes

⁶ "I am ashamd of my self, that I am so much behind hand with you in kindness" *Ibid.*, p. 58

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ "About a fortnight ago I had an intimation from a friend by letter, That one of the Secretaryes, I suppose Trenchard had informd the Queen, that I had abusd her Government, (those were the words) in my Epistle to my Lord Radclyffe, & that thereupon, she had commanded her Historiographer Rymer, to fall upon my Playes, w^{ch} he assures me is now doing" *Ibid.*, pp. 58-9.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 118-9

¹¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1693*, p. 270

letters sent to the Admirals of the Fleet on July 7¹² which show that the fleet had entered Torbay harbor some days earlier. It was ordered to sea with all possible haste on July 11,¹³ orders which were repeated on July 14,¹⁴ and on July 16, 1693¹⁵ It had apparently sailed by July 22, when dispatches are recorded from the fleet at sea¹⁶

In the statement in the letter Dryden does not say that the fleet had arrived. The passage betrays impatience at the presence of the fleet there when it was needed elsewhere, for he writes, "All things favour the Monarch, who pushes round him & our Fleet yesterday was in Torbay . . ." The repeated orders to the Admirals are most urgent in tone, one even stating that if the wind was adverse, that the ships try to "tide it out of the channel,"¹⁷ a highly dangerous maneuver. The continued delay must have been the talk of the town, and Dryden apparently is here reflecting the popular irritation.

There is further evidence favoring the date in July. Dryden mentions the capture of Huy, the report of which reached London on July 18¹⁸. Rooke's defeat, mentioned in the letter, occurred on June 6,¹⁹ and by August 1, he had been sent to Gibraltar²⁰.

It may be objected that Dryden says he had already told Walsh of Huy's defeat, which would have meant a letter to Walsh dated not earlier than July 18. But this is by no means an impossibility. Walsh had written to Dryden for his help in obtaining the post of Teller of the Exchequer, and in view of the importance of the business to Walsh, Dryden must, out of common courtesy, have kept him well posted. The position was actually given to Henry Carey, who was sworn in on July 17,²¹ and Dryden wrote on Thursday, the day after he heard about it, to tell Walsh of the disappointment. The only Thursday which falls between the appointment of Carey and the receipt of the news of Huy's defeat on the one hand, and the departure of the fleet from Torbay on the other, was July 20, 1693, and this, therefore, and not August 17, must be the real date of this letter.

HENRY HITCH ADAMS

Cornell University

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 216

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 220

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 225

²⁰ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1693*, p. 231

²¹ *Ward, op cit.*, p. 165

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 227

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 232

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 216

¹⁸ *Ward, op cit.*, p. 166

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

SOME LINGUISTIC STUDIES OF 1945-1948¹

A number of important books in the linguistic field have come out, or have become available, since I printed my last survey.² Perhaps the most useful of them, to the beginner at least, is Professor E H Sturtevant's *Introduction to Linguistic Science*.³ The author in his Preface tells us that "this volume is intended for readers with no previous knowledge of linguistics," and he has obviously tried hard to make his presentation of the subject as simple and untechnical as he could. Occasionally, however, his own special interests lead him to take up matters hardly suitable for a book of this kind. Thus, sections 233-234 deal with the Hittite connective particles *ta*, *su*, and *nu*, and with their equivalents in the Indo-European languages, a special problem beautifully presented and of great importance and interest to Indo-Europeanists, but heavy going for beginners. We are told that "technical terms have generally been avoided . . . and such technical terms as seemed necessary have been explained" (Preface), but this promise is not always carried out, thus, few novices would understand what Sturtevant means by "personal nouns" (p. 159), a locution not familiar to the general reader yet left unexplained. In general, however, the author succeeds in what he is trying to do, and his book is the best thing we have to put in the hands of students in their first year of graduate work. The following comments on various details may prove useful when the book is revised.

P ix the phonetic symbols [a] and [ɪ], though used in the book, are not listed. P 10 the description of the glottal stop leaves much to be desired. The author evidently does not realize that it is the stoppage, not the release of this stoppage, that makes the articulation a stop, indeed, he describes the glottal stop as "a slight cough," heard when "the vocal cords are suddenly drawn apart." But in the English particles *yep* and *nope* (where *p* symbolizes the glottal stop) the release is not heard at all, and it would manifestly be wrong to describe this articulation as "a slight cough." P 11 English *sh* is not made with "an incomplete

¹ This survey is restricted to books sent to *MLN* for review.

² *MLN* LX (1945) 535-568. Several books published before 1945 but not then accessible to me because of the war have now reached me and are included in the present survey.

³ Yale Univ Press. New Haven, 1947. Pp x + 173. \$3.

closure between the front surface of the tongue and the hard palate," a description more nearly applicable to Swedish *sk*. For a better description of *sh*, see my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic*, p. 11.

Pp. 11-15 here the author treats stop articulation at some length, but his analysis suffers from the same deficiencies that we noted in his description of the glottal stop. He divides a stop into three parts (see p. 14 top), but is compelled to admit that only one of these, the stoppage or, as he puts it, "the central period during which the breath is held," is indispensable. Stops not preceded by an implosion or succeeded by an explosion he regards as defective. Thus, he tells us that "English [b] as well as [p] lacks one or more of its parts in certain positions" (p. 12 bottom), and later he writes of "partial p's" and of a *b* which may be "more or less complete" (p. 15 top). In other cases he simply ignores familiar articulations. Thus, the description he gives of intervocalic [p] holds good of the fortis but not of the lenis, which lacks the explosive release that Sturtevant makes an integral part of the phoneme. How much simpler and sounder it would all be if the author identified the stop with the stoppage, and explained the so-called implosion and explosion, not as parts one and three of the stop, parts which, oddly enough, may fail to put in an appearance, but as transition sounds, made in shifting to and from the phoneme.

P. 13 the *m* in words like *rhythm* and *bottom* is hardly sonantal, but is preceded by schwa. P. 15 the [ɪ] in the transcription of *spin* and *pin* is a mistake for [i]. P. 17 in saying that "the vowel phoneme [i] is eliminated" the author confuses sign with sound. The phonetic analysis expressed by [ɪ] makes the "long e" a diphthong the first element of which is identified with the "short i."

P. 23 (note 7) the change of prehistoric Greek *s* to *h* before vowels presumably took place by lenition, that is, the articulation became loose and lax, and no such stage as [ɣ] is to be presumed. If the sound underwent velarization, one would expect this to occur only before back vowels, but actually the quality of the vowel had nothing to do with the sound change. The use of the Semitic letter *chet* to represent the lenited *s* points at most to an articulation like that of *ch* in German *ich*, though surely much more open. P. 27 the Germanic runes are now no longer derived from the Greek alphabet. As Arthur Norden puts it (*Berichte zur Rünenforschung* 1, 26), "herrscht Einigkeit darüber, dass die Runen schrift auf der Grundlage irgendeines norditalischen Alphabets geschaffen wurde." P. 36 the "arrowhead pointing to the left" actually points to the right, presumably by misprint. I note other misprints on pp. 49, 131, and 160. The transcription of the *y* of *fancy* etc. with [ɪ] instead of [i] is unorthodox, but may be deliberate. See p. 17.

On p. 88 and elsewhere the author uses the technical term pre-Germanic in a way surely unusual if not indeed individual. He says, "pre-Germanic seems to have changed *hveðwör* ['four'] to *feðwör* by anticipation of the inherited *f* of the next numeral." The form *hveðwör* (better *hveðwör*) is here called pre-Germanic even though it exemplifies both the first or Germanic consonantal sound-shift and Vernerian voicing. If this form is

pre Germanic, what further changes are needed to make it Germanic? Be it added that the change of *sw* to *f* is an easy one, phonetically, and occurs in other Germanic words, as *oven*. In the present case, the phonetic tendency might have been reinforced by dissimilation *sw w* became *f w*. The *f* of the next numeral may have played a part too, but its influence is not needed to explain the change.

P 94 the connexion of *beer* with *brew* is not now in favor with the etymologists, who prefer to connect *beer* with OE *bēow* 'barley' and to explain the word as naming in the first place a drink made from barley. P 136 in the second Cicero quotation *letet* may be rendered with 'let,' by contrast with the *letet* of the Ovid quotation, where the meaning is clearly 'though'. P 147 *Pwyll* does not exemplify initial [pw], as the *w* here has the value [u]. P 158 the proto-Germanic word for 'father' was not *fader* but *fāðer*, or perhaps preferably *fap̥ðer*, one's choice depends on what one means by proto-

Another useful book is *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names**. The compiler has contributed a 26-page introductory essay divisible into two parts: first, some account of the various systems of name-giving (e.g. Semitic, Greek, Roman, Germanic) which lie behind the heterogeneous mass of given names in use today, and secondly, a short historical sketch of English name-giving, starting with Old English names and coming down to "Modern Eclecticism". The articles of the dictionary proper may likewise be described as short essays. In each the history of the name is traced, with special attention to its history in English use. A valuable feature is the list of early English spellings (with sources specified) at the end of many of the articles.

Unluckily the book is deficient on the etymological side. In her preface the author rightly points out that previous works on given names "are for the most part almost valueless". This cannot be said of her book, but its etymologies must be used with the greatest caution, as she seems to have little control of the material and relies on earlier etymologists who in some cases (e.g., Forstermann) enjoy little or no authority. It is impossible in the space at my disposal to point out more than a few of the bad or doubtful etymologies given in this book. The following samples will have to serve.

Aine, Aithne this name has no connection with "Celt *Aodhnart*, f. dim of *Aodh*, 'fire,'" as the palatalization reveals. The name-forms are mere

* Compiled by E. G. Withycombe. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1947. Pp. xxxviii + 142. \$3.00.

variants of Irish *ethne* 'kernel, fruit,' also used as a woman's name. This use is ancient, the proper name appears in Old Icelandic as *Eðna*. The modern English *Edna* may be the same name, although Dinneen says that *Ethne* is often Englished as *Annie*. Here and elsewhere Miss Withycombe uses Celtic for Irish or Welsh, a practice as objectionable as it would be to label a distinctively English name (like *Eduard*) simply Germanic. Such labels make a false impression, giving rise as they do to wrong ideas about the age and distribution of the name.

Alfred the French forms mentioned do not go back to the latinized and bookish *Aluredus* (1 e, *Alvredus*), but to OE *Ælfred*, the *f* of which was pronounced [v], the final *d* of the English name was soon lost (by way of *ð*) in the mouths of Frenchmen. The [f] of modern English *Alfred* is presumably a spelling pronunciation.

Asketil, Anketil "OE *Oscytel* and Norse *Asketel* were superseded by the Norman forms *Ansketil*, *Anketil* which exhibit typical French nasalization." But there is nothing French about this nasalization (other than the spelling). The *as* of the Scandinavian form was originally *ans-* and when the *n* was lost the preceding vowel became nasalized in Scandinavian speech, the Normans simply kept this pronunciation, indicating it orthographically with an *n*.

Bardolph "Oger *Berhtolf*, compound of *berhta* 'bright,' and *wulf* 'wolf.'" This etymology is obviously wrong. *Bardolph* is to be explained as a dissimilated variant of *Baldwulf*. It will be noted that Miss Withycombe gives the supposed etymon as Old German, without making it clear that the two elements of which it is composed are given, not in their Old German form but in their Germanic stem form. This practice, which she follows throughout, is very misleading, particularly so since the stem forms given are nearly always hypothetical reconstructions, not forms actually recorded.

Berenger here and elsewhere Miss Withycombe works with a ghost word *ganu* 'spear' which got into learned literature by a misreading of a Gothic text. The second element of *Berenger* is Old German *ger* 'spear,' going back to Germanic **garaz*.

Brunhild, Brynhild "probably a compound of Oger *brunja* 'breast' and *hild* 'battle.'" The first element actually means, not breast but corslet. Its Old German form was not *brunja* but *brunna*, cognate with OE *byrne*, Icelandic *brynja*, and Gothic *brunjo*. The word is usually connected with Old Irish *bruinne* 'breast' and explained as a Celtic contribution to the Germanic vocabulary.

Eric "ONorse *Eyrekr*, MNoise *Evrík*, Ger *Erich*, the second element is the common Teutonic root meaning 'rule, government,' the first is doubtful." Almost everything about this etymological statement is unfortunate. The form *Eyrekr*, presented as the oldest and therefore presumably the closest to the original, is in fact late and without etymological value. The second element, cognate with Gothic *reiks*, means 'ruler,' not 'rule, government.' It is to be identified with the element *-riw* in Gaulish personal names, an element cognate with Latin *rex*. Under *Frederic* and else

where Miss Withycombe gives to the element the erroneous form *ricja* as well as an erroneous meaning, sometimes, however, as under *Godric*, she isolates the form correctly but gives to it the erroneous meaning 'powerful'. The first element *ci*, which she marks "doubtful," is in fact reasonably clear. In all likelihood it goes back to an earlier *en-* (compare *Ennarr*), the *n* of which was lost before *r*. See A. Noreen, *Altisl. Gram.* (4th ed.), p. 220. As a word it means 'one' but as a name element may have meant 'unique' or the like.

Goodeth the second element here, as also under *Edith*, is identified with OE *guth* 'war,' but under *Aldith* its form is more correctly given as *gyth* (a derivative of *guth*). But even this form is not quite right, since it does not occur except in composition, it should be written *-gyth*. In one of these entries the corresponding name element in the other Germanic dialects should have been mentioned.

The English often go wrong when it comes to American usage, and one is therefore not surprised to find Miss Withycombe making slips in this matter. In her introduction she says (p. xxxiv),

Besides the common Old Testament names there are others which have taken firm root in America, such as *Ira*, *Seth*, *Jedediah*, *Elihu*, and the commoner ones, *Abraham*, *Adam*, *Isaac*, *Benjamin*, *Samuel*, *Daniel*, &c., which are now rare in England, are still in general use in the USA.

Of all these names, only the last three are now much used in this country, I should say, the others occur rarely, except in certain families where they are traditional. Much the same applies to *Chauncey*, *Cyrus*, and *Dwight*, names which Miss Withycombe records respectively as in "general use," "regularly used," and "common" in the United States.

Vol. XIX of the English Place-Name Society series⁵ maintains the high standards set in the earlier volumes, despite the death of Sir Allen Mawer, the senior general editor. This volume is appropriately dedicated "to the memory of Walter W. Skeat, who, in his *Place-names of Cambridgeshire* (1901), laid the foundations of modern Place-name study." Certain details which for one reason or another need attention are commented on below.

Pp. xxii-xxiii. The terms *Anglo-Norman*, *French*, *Norman-French*, and *Norman* seem to be used interchangeably, perhaps for stylistic reasons. But it may be that the author makes some distinctions in meaning here. If so, the reader should be given some clue. If not, it would be more scientific to stick to a single term, preferably *French*. P. xxx. the two

⁵ P. H. Reaney, *The Place-Names of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely*. Cambridge Univ. Press. London, 1943. Pp. lxi + 396. 23s. 6d.

footnotes are not numbered P xxxiii OE long *a* is left out P xxxvi fricative or stop pronunciation of *h* (in the combination *hw*) is not properly described as "over aspiration" P 13 the discussion of *Ouse* and *Wissey* fails to deal with the *ss*, which must be explained if the identification is to be established Pp 15 ff only the form *Staven* is dealt with, the older *Stan* and the later *Stern* being passed over, although the modern *Starnea* 'Stain river' obviously goes back to *Stern* In my opinion the oldest form, *Upstancote*, should be made the point of departure This is to be analyzed as 'the stone cottage upstream,' the element *stan* going back to OE *stæn*-, a variant of *stānen*-, 'of stone' Both *Staven* and *Stern* may go back to the full form *stānen*-, by a dissimilation which changed the first *n* to *v* in the one case, to *r* in the other The *e* of *Stern* may represent OE *æ* or it may be a modern spelling for *a* before *r*

P 38 The development of the long vowel of *Cambridge* is not satisfactorily explained as "a nasalising and a lengthening" Actually the short vowel was diphthongized to *au* before the nasal, later, the *u* was lost before the labial, *m*, but what was left of the diphthong (viz, the *a*) continued to be held as long as the whole diphthong had been, in other words, the *a* underwent lengthening P 58 perhaps *Melbourn* means 'babbling brook' (cf OE *meldian* 'tell, reveal') P 60 *Mettle* hardly shows "development of *o* to *e*" but rather substitution of *e* for *o*, by contamination of late ME *moot* with *meeting*, or with the verb *meet* P 70 in *Orwell* the OE synonyms *ōr* and *ord* may have been used interchangeably, one can see no reason for the loss of *d* before *w*

P 140 the criticism of Anderson seems pointless Between "he takes it to be OE *flēmēna-dīc* 'fugitives' dyke," and "more probably we have to start with OE *flēmēna-dīc* 'dyke of the fugitives,'" the difference is too slight to matter P 166 the first element of *Drayton* may go back to OE *dræg* in the unrecorded sense 'water course' The corresponding Icelandic word *drag* has this sense in the plural P 198 *EME* is a misprint for *EModE* P 200 since the first element of *Mettleham* never has *d*, it can hardly be identified with *middle* The 17th century *Meatlam* points to a long vowel, and *Mettle*- may go back to an unrecorded OE *mættla* 'dreamer' P 205 the *t* of *creast* may have arisen quite independently of *crest*, compare *hest*, OE *hæts*

P 217 the first element of *Chettisham* hardly goes back to OE *Cett*, since no forms with *tt* occur until the end of the 15th century One is also reluctant to explain the forms in *Chedes* as "due to voicing of intervocalic *t*," in the absence of parallels P 221 (top) OE *stunt* is cognate with Icelandic *stuttur* 'short, short spoken' and MHG *stunz* 'short' The OE meaning 'foolish' seems clearly to be a secondary development, and the Cambridgeshire 'blunt of manner, steep' may well be a survival from ancient times

P 223 for *Germanic* read *German* P. 225 (bottom) the metathetic form of *aspe* would be *apse*, not *apes*, and this etymology of *Apes* must be rejected Why not *ape's*? P 226 *chan* for *chân* or *chare* is probably a case of dissimilation, arising in names like *March Chare*, *Chaur Farm*, *Chairbridge* See p 254, where the change is wrongly stigmatized as a

"corruption" P 231 one cannot accept the connection made between *Grunty* and "the Teutonic stem *grunþo*," in spite of the 17th-century *d*-spelling P 238 *Stoubrigge* 1417 may be for *Stonbrigge* by misreading but hardly by any phonetic process, since *ou*, if genuine, is a diphthong P 289 (footnote) the oldest form, *Burbecch*, may be "a bad one" but it is supported by *Burbecch* 1840, and possibly its first element goes back to OE *būr* 'cottage' If so, the current *Bird* is a blend of *Bud*- and *Bur*-

Max Forster's huge book, *Der Flussname Themse und seine Sippe*,⁶ is a masterpiece of its kind It abounds in good things and in particular it serves to supplement and correct E Ekwall's pioneer book on English river-names (see *MLN* XLIV 503 f) The subtitle, "Studien zur Anglisierung keltischer Eigennamen und zur Lautchronologie des Altbritischen," brings out the scope and importance of the work better than does its title According to the title-page, these studies were read to the Bavarian Academy at a meeting held on Jan 15, 1927, but presumably only the nucleus of the book was then presented As it now stands, the work falls into two parts an "Allgemeiner Teil" (pp 1-366), divided into seven chapters,⁷ and a "Spezieller Teil" (pp 367-764), divided into 15 chapters, most of which are devoted each to a single river-name Then come three appendices (pp 765-841), a section of "Nachtrage und Besserungen" (pp 842-857), five word-indices (pp. 858-937), the last two of which are misnumbered, and a "Sachregister" (pp 938-951).

It is impossible, in the space at my disposal, to signalize the many contributions to knowledge made in this admirable work I must restrict myself to points on which I cannot agree with the author, and to the correction of slips, together with occasional additions to the material which the author has brought together

P 45 To Shakespeare's *Herford* add *Harford* Co in Maryland Pp 45-47 the theory of "Verstarkung" which Forster here sets up seems to me dubious In all the examples which he lists as sure cases, the medial

⁶ Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, Jahrgang 1941, Band I München, 1941 [actually published in April, 1942] Pp xii + 951

⁷ The chapter headings are 1 Verhältnis von Fluss- und Ortsname, 2 Sprachliche Herkunft der ne Flussnamen, 3 Nach welchen Eigenschaften können Flüsse benannt werden? 4 Ziele und Aufgaben der Flussnamenforschung, 5 Die Erforschung der Geschichte der Flussnamenformen, 6 Flexion und Genus der ae Flussnamen, 7 Bisherige Forschung. The seventh chapter is primarily a critique of Ekwall's book

velar nasal can be explained as a product of dissimilation, *n n* becoming *ng n* P 48 the explanation given for *Ripponden* is puzzling, the ME form has no "vorausgehendes *p*" which would cause "Assimilation des Anlautes" of the medial element *burne* One can only say that the 16th-century form *Rybonden* shows loss of *r* (presumably by assimilation), and the modern form shows an unexplained unvoicing of the earlier *b* The discussion of *Okehampton* should include a cross reference to p 65 The form *Tenbury* is best explained, not as a case of "doppelte" assimilation, but as a case in which *md* became *nd* by place-assimilation, and *ndb* then became *nb* by loss of *d* in the heavy consonant group P 58 the discussion of *Yvelde* should include a cross-reference to p 55

P 64 footnote Shakespeare's rimes *key survey* and *key may* are normal, the modern pronunciation of *key* had *nɔi* then come in, see *NED* P 70 here and elsewhere the author credits the Norman scribes with introducing "einen wahllosen Wechsel zwischen *t* und *th*" which actually goes much further back, confusion between *t* and *th* is a characteristic of Latin orthography from post-classical times and flourished throughout the Middle Ages, one is not surprised to find it infecting vernacular orthography as well P. 75 bottom OE *Lygeanbyrg* failed to become ModE **Lingbury* because there was no *n* in the second element to produce dissimilation (see my comments above on "Verstärkung") P 92 note 3 one must be skeptical of Forster's connection of OE *scytere* etc with MHG *schutte* 'rubbish,' since no such word occurs in English (the OE word means 'shooter') Ekwall is probably right in explaining the rounded vowel in some of the names as due to influence from initial *sh* A cross-reference to p 331, note 4 would have been desirable

P 107 the author's theories about linguistic change leave me wholly skeptical There is surely no reason to believe that an *Unterschicht* would have more progressive tendencies than an *Oberschicht* True aristocracies normally feel free to speak as they please, they set the styles while the rest conform, in speech as in other matters Linguistic change does not have to start at the bottom, it may just as well start at the top We know little about such things, of course, but Forster's speculations here seem out of place as well as unconvincing

P 157 (see also p 844) the critical spirit which elsewhere makes Forster's approach so fruitful here fails him, he accepts without question Pedersen's statement (*Vergl Gram* I 21) that Irish *rón* and *rót* go back to OE *hran* and *rād* respectively This is the more surprising in that Forster, as an Anglicist, might be expected to see at once what is wrong with these connections As regards *ron* 'seal,' this word, by virtue of its meaning, obviously cannot be linked with OE *hran* 'reindeer' It can be linked with OE *hron* 'whale,' since this word seems sometimes to be applied to other sea-beasts (see Toller, *Supplement*, s v) But *hron* has a short vowel The long vowel of the Irish word may be explained on the theory that *rón* got into Irish, not directly from English, but by way of Old Welsh, where the *o* would undergo lengthening As for *rót* 'way,' which answers to MWelsh *rhawd* 'course,' Forster recognizes the phonetic difficulty involved in the connection with OE *rād* 'riding, raid,' but he

ignores the semantic difficulties, which are prohibitive. Like many others, he simply puts back into medieval English the modern meaning (first recorded from the year 1596). His argument that "der Brite kein langes *a* mehi hatte" and therefore in adopting the OE word *rad* substituted his long open *o* for the OE long *a* reads very strangely indeed, since he has just told us (in his discussion of the river name *Tone*) of the rise of a long *a* in Old Welsh. In truth, OIrish *rot* 'way' and MWelsh *rhawd* 'course' cannot be connected with OE *rad* (modern *road*) but must be explained otherwise. They may go back to an IE **ōth-*, lengthened grade of the base **reth-* 'run,' a connection which would explain the Welsh meaning 'course' well enough.

P 198 the river-name *Derwent*, and the surnames *Carey*, *Chew*, and *Glow*, are in D Jones, *Engl Pron Dict* P 260, note 1 the discussion of the name of the Ests is inadequate, see my paper in *Speculum* VIII 67 ff. Pp 262-263 footnote (see also p 848) the long discussion of the names in Alfred's account of Wulfstan's voyage includes various dubious assumptions, thus, that the Cotton scribe knew nothing of contemporary Scandinavian geographical names and copied mechanically what he saw before him, a theory which makes his accurate reproduction of certain Scandinavian pronunciations of his own day mere accidents. One objects, too, to the author's belief that the English had no words of their own for Scandinavia or its parts, even when they themselves lived in Scandinavia, a period which Forster calls a "kontinentale Entlehnungszeit" (p 262 bottom). His excellent suggestion that the *Lēland* of the Cotton text goes back to an Alfredian **Lealand* he himself rejects, because it would represent a "borrowing" of the sixth century or earlier. Now and then he simply ignores the late date of the Cotton text, thus, in saying that OE *Blōwinga-æg* "setzt voraus, dass urnord *ei* schon im 9 Jahrhundert zu aschwed *ē* monophthongiert war."

P 332, note 3 to the list of words which were inflected both strong and weak should be added a few examples, at least, of proper names, as the *Hrēpel* and *Hrēdla* of *Beowulf*, see *MP* XL 16 bottom. P 374 top the *n* of *Tanfield* (for *Tamfield*) is hardly an example of assimilation, since *f* after all is a labial, not a dental, and a labiodental *m* would still be an *m*, not an *n*. P 382, note 1 one or more words have dropped out of the sentence after the dash.

Pp 405 ff the discussion of the medieval forms of *Tamar* is not very enlightening. The "altenglische Normalform" was doubtless *Tamer*, as Forster says, but when he adds, "alter *Tamar*," one is not sure just what he means. The oldest recorded form in English is *Tamur*, from a document of the late 10th century. Forster thinks the *u* of this form a scribal error for *a*, and this apparently leads him to conclude that *Tamar* was an OE form actually once on record though miscopied. If so, the *-ar* (instead of *-er*) presumably reflected the leveling of unstressed vowels for which there is good evidence in the late 10th century, see my paper in the *Curme Volume* (1930), pp 110 ff. Certainly we have no reason to think that an early OE form **Tamar* existed. By Alfred's day, in all likelihood, this name had reached the stage *Tamr*, though it continued to

be spelt *Tamer*, see Luick, *Gram*, p. 317. This stage is reflected, I think, in ME *Tame* (presumably an oblique case form in origin), a form not properly explained as "franzosiert". ME *Tambre* likewise seems to be a native form, see Jordan Matthes, *ME Gram*, p. 187. The forms *Tambre* and *Tandre*, however, are obviously gallicized.

P. 532 a spelling pronunciation of *Esther* too is often heard nowadays.
 P. 555 one can hardly believe that the privileges of the German merchants in London c. 1000 were granted to them "weil man sich der Blutsverwandschaft mit den Niedersachsen noch bewusst war". P. 590, note 1 the Leningrad MS of Bede's *History* likewise has *u*, not *y*, in the Lichfield name, according to O. S. Anderson (see *MLN* LX 556 f).
 P. 652 footnote Forster's objections to the transcriptions of the voiced bilabial fricative now usual among the Celticists are soundly based, but his own transcriptions are likewise objectionable. *w* should not be used for a fricative but should be restricted to the semivowel. The regular phonetic symbol for the fricative is the crossed *b*, and Forster actually uses this symbol for lenited *b* but not for lenited *m*, even though this had lost its nasalization. The unfortunate results of his *w* transcription are most evident, perhaps, on p. 680, where he speaks of a "Reibelaut *v*, aus alterem ae *w*," with reference to the *f* of OE *Defnas* (modern *Devon*). Since *w* is ordinarily used to transcribe the runic letter *wynn*, in OE orthography, its use for the bilabial fricative as well is a bit confusing, to say the least. But the confusion extends throughout Forster's long discussion of the lenited *m* and makes things unduly hard for the uninitiated.

P. 668 it is wrong to say of fricative *m* that "ein solcher Laut war aber den Angelsachsen, wie allen Germanen, völlig unbekannt". I have discussed (among other things) the fricative *m* and fricative *n* of Old Norse in *RES* III 261-266 and IV 266-268. The fricative *m* of Old English occurs only before *n*, and is marked by a vacillation between *m* and *f* in the spelling, as in *nefne* or *nemne* 'except'. In prehistoric times English presumably had a fricative *m* (later lost) in words like *fif* 'five'.
 P. 704 it is incredible that the English "apperceived" a British nasalized *a* as their own *æ*, such a nasal or nasalized *a* would have been equated rather with OE *a* or *o*.
 P. 706 in spite of the author's theories, the name *Devon* evidently came into English early. The want of an *m*-spelling presumably means that in this word the fricative lost its nasalization early. One may conjecture that this was due to the fact that another nasal immediately followed. If so, the loss of nasality can be explained as a case of dissimilation: nasal plus nasal became oral plus nasal. No such change can be postulated for English, where, as we have seen, fricative *m* occurs only before *n*. We are driven to conclude, then, that it was in British speech that lenited *m* early lost its nasality in the position immediately before *n*. I have noted misprints on pp. 6, 12, 17, 24, 56, 99, 133, 160, 195, 223, 259, 269, 395, 405, 494, 565, 585, 594, 601, 677, 697, 714.

Professor Massey's study⁸ is the first instalment of a "wider survey which is promised in the title" (Preface). It makes a

⁸ B. W. A. Massey, *Fish-Names in the British Commonwealth and the*

marked contrast with Max Forster's study of river-names by virtue of its brevity. The author manages to get a great deal into a very small space, though he is far from having exhausted the subject. His devices for condensation are a bit confusing at times, and his lists and statistical tables might have been arranged better, but the material is there, and can be examined with profit, once one has learned the complexities of his system of presentation. He summarizes his conclusions thus

we see an island with rivers and lakes abounding in fishes, now scientifically distinguished into 43 species, to which have in course of time been given 39 distinctive, and usually monosyllabic, English names. Only 2 of these seem to have been brought by the fifth century Germanic invaders from their earlier continental homes. The names which the early English gave are found to be drawn from several linguistic sources, and, when decipherable, to have originally been descriptive of the bearer's colour, appearance, action, or habit, or sometimes metaphorical, recalling a spike, a slug, or a shadow. (pp. 60-61)

It is to be hoped that the author will continue his investigations, and that the remaining instalments will be presented in fuller and more readable form.

Professor Ekwall's monograph⁹ shows the mastery of the material and the capacity for significant generalization which was to be expected of the author. The work falls into four chapters. The first and longest of these lists and discusses the "Old English baptismal names in post-Conquest London" (pp. 1-90). Chapter two deals with "the exchange of Old English or Old Scandinavian names for Norman-French" (pp. 91-117). Chapter three takes up "by-names and surnames" (pp. 118-178), and the last chapter is made up of a number of "phonological notes" (pp. 179-197). Appended to this chapter is a generalization about London English of the greatest importance for historians of our language. I quote the last sentence (p. 198)

The probability appears to be that London English had reached the Middle English stage about the time of the Conquest, and that the boundary line between Old and Middle English, so far as spoken London English is concerned, should be drawn about the middle of the eleventh century.

⁹ U. S. A., *a Study in Semantics*. I. Fresh Water-Fish Names in the British Isles. Posnan Univ. Press, Posnan, 1948. Pp. 64.

⁹ E. Ekwall, *Early London Personal Names*. Acta Reg. Soc. Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis XLIII. Lund, 1947. Pp. xx + 208.

We have no reason to think that the English of London was at a stage more advanced than was the English of the rest of the country in the eleventh century. On the contrary, it shared the conservatism of the south, where linguistic change proceeded at a slower pace than it did in the north of England. The date 1050 for the beginning of the Middle English period errs, if at all, on the conservative side.¹⁰

Certain details in Ekwall's masterly book call for comment of one sort or another

P 39 to the examples under *Godleofu* should be added the Chaucerian *Godelief* (*CT*, B 3084), the reconstructed OE form should surely be *Gode-* rather than *God-*. P 47 the form *Hardelet*, though marked "sic," answers to OE *Heardred* well enough, its *l* is due to dissimilation, its *t* to final unvoicing, and its medial *e* is best taken as a svarabhakti vowel. P 106 *Aiturus* is surely a Welsh or Breton, not a French name. Pp 124 ff the author goes too far when he interprets as inherited surnames certain occupational by-names. Thus, the moneyer Johannes Peucier may have got his by-name before he became a minter, or he may have done work in leather as a hobby, in which case his by-name would be bestowed upon him by his fellow-moneyers. Pp 126 f the by-name *Sunessune*, in spite of Ekwall's "no doubt," was hardly pronounced "with one stress (on the first syllable)." P 137 the ME by-name *Balle* goes back to ON *Balla*, in my opinion. P 147 Ekwall's etymology of the by-name *Dang(er)* wants plausibility, as he himself recognizes. One may suggest for source ON *dengr* 'sharpener, hammerer,' a word actually used as a nickname, the *a* is parallel to that of *Wannoc* (p 170). P 157 the by-name *Lobbe*, literally 'spider,' if it actually refers to the man's person, probably marks him not as "a lean person" but as a man with a fat body (or paunch) but spindly arms and legs. P 161 the by-name *Pineferding* 'torment farthing' may be compared with *pinchpenny*, though pinching is a mild form of torment. P 190 if *y* answers to OE *eo*, it is presumably a spelling variant of East Saxon *i*, see *Godelief* (p 39 bottom).

Ekwall has also published a short study called *American and British Pronunciation*,¹¹ a somewhat expanded version of a paper "read at the Anglo-American week at Uppsala in the autumn of 1943" (p 7). His study is essentially historical, and he is concern-

¹⁰ See my paper, "When did Middle English begin?", in the *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies* (Baltimore, 1930), pp. 110-117. For another dating, based, it would seem, on the survival of traditional orthography rather than on the characteristics of the language as such, see A. C. Baugh, in *A Literary History of England* (New York, 1948), p. 109.

¹¹ The American Institute in the University of Uppsala. Essays and Studies. II Uppsala, 1946. Pp. 38.

ed chiefly to explain "the agreement between eighteenth-century American and British pronunciation" (p 30) and the differentiation which took place later on. He summarizes his conclusions as follows

educated American speech was under the influence of Standard British all through the Colonial period and shared the development of Standard British. When the Colonies became independent, the direct and close communication with the Mother Country ceased, and the new country even placed itself consciously in opposition to England and everything British, also as regards language. From that time on, American pronunciation has been on the whole independent of British, the result has been that American pronunciation has not come to share the development undergone later by Standard British, but remains at about the stage it had reached by the time of the Revolution.

In my opinion these conclusions are correct, subject to a few qualifications which need not be specified here. In the course of his paper the author makes some statements in need of correction.

Pp. 15 ff. the author has missed an important feature of New England speech, namely, its [a] phoneme (as against the [ɑ] of the rest of the country), a phoneme which differs in quality and quantity alike from the unrounded short o. P. 16 short [æ] hardly occurs in words like *calf*, *half*, the vowel is long or half-long everywhere, I think. P. 20 the o of *process* (though not of *progress*) is often long in American speech. P. 23 unrounded short o is widespread, though not general, in New England as elsewhere. P. 25 the o of *ory* is commonly [o] in America, though [ɔ] may also be heard. P. 26 the r of *Worcester* was probably lost by assimilation, not by dissimilation. P. 28 the tt of *bottle* is not intervocalic, truly intervocalic t (as in *pity*) has a lenited rather than a voiced pronunciation, though a secondary voicing may take place. P. 32 I agree with Kurath rather than with the author as regards the prevalence of Southern English Standard pronunciation in other parts of England before the nineteenth century, indeed, even in that century Southern speech did not become general among the gentry until late.

On his last page the author regrets that he "had no means of finding out to what extent young [colonial] Americans frequented the universities of the Mother Country." If *The American Oxonian* of January, 1942, had been accessible to him, he would have found there an enlightening paper by Willard Connely on "Colonial Americans in Oxford and Cambridge."

After H. L. Mencken brought out the fourth edition of his *American Language* in 1936, so much new material came into his hands that he had to choose between a fifth edition and a series of

supplements He decided upon the latter course,¹² but his two supplementary volumes are so written that they can be read independently of the earlier work, although the material is presented under the same headings and subheadings, the first supplement answering to Chapters I-VI, the second to Chapters VII-XI of the fourth edition In order to knit new and old together the author repeats himself here and there, but his repetitions (marked as such by brackets), all told, amount to no more than a few pages The new matter consists, in part, of documents and studies in existence before 1936 but not then known to Mencken or used by him, in part, of documents and studies which have become available since 1936 Much in the two supplements is based on the author's own collections, much is based on the work of other investigators The two volumes add enormously to our information about American speech, and must be reckoned a major contribution to the subject But the richness and fulness of the presentation are not the whole story As everybody knows, Mencken has the talent, not always found in learned writers, of making his material come alive Moreover, he is careful to tell us where he got his information, and his footnotes and indexes would do credit to the most painstaking and conscientious Ph.D of the strictest school These books, though meant first of all for the delectation of the general reading public, are duly equipped with the needful scholarly apparatus, and, along with the work to which they are supplementary, give us by far the best survey of American speech in existence

The following comments on matters of detail may prove useful for a new edition :

SUPPLEMENT I

P. 2 Malone's name was Edmond, not Edmund P. 8 *an't* is the older spelling of *aren't* (as in *aren't I?*), not of *ain't* P. 11 Witherspoon's "two first" needs no *sic* (see II 337) P. 14 *falcon* still has no *l* in the speech of falconers P. 18 the author's spelling *counselling* is British¹ P. 25 Webster was right in thinking that British English would change more than would American, though his reasons for so thinking were poor P. 27 Jones's famous statement about Sanskrit was made in 1786, not 1796 Pp. 62 and 107 Manly left Brown for Chicago in 1898 P. 80 Edgerton's paper appeared in the Proceedings of the American Philological Society (not Association) P. 122 one is surprised to find

¹² *The American Language*, Supplement I (pp xviii + 740 + xxxv, \$5) ; Supplement II (pp xiv + 890 + xlii, \$7.50) Knopf New York, 1945-1948

Mencken endorsing Bryant's condemnation of *over* for *more than* and to *loan* for *to lend* P 137, n 2 for Old read old P 146 for *Anglistische* read *Englische*, and, two lines below, for *Sprach* read *Sprache* P 155 the "recent Irish observer" dated the beginning of American speech 13 years too late, a slip which Mencken might well have pointed out P 159 bottom *wabble* is probably from Low German, not High P 161 for 'round read round

P 188 for Niceae read Nicaea P 189 what is said about *dope* here does not agree with what is said on p 319 P 197 *bayou* is from Choctaw *bayuk* through La French P 209 Sherwood meant to say that *holpe* 'helped' came to be pronounced *hope*, he hardly had the noun *hope* in mind P 225 for policy read police P 276 after *hofgor* add *so*, as no such word ever existed P 389 lettered in swimming means not 'majored' but 'won his letter' (i.e. won the right to wear the initial letter of his school) P 395 *phone* and *vamp* are shortenings but not back formations. P 407 along with words in *-minded* etc words in *-wide* might have been discussed

P 450 *pinch* 'steal' is not an Americanism P 463 *carrousel* is known to me as a French word only, whereas I have known *merry go round* from childhood P 464 *commencement* is not an Americanism, we got it from Cambridge Univ, where it is still used The Oxford word *act* means 'public defense of a thesis,' not 'commencement' P 468 the English say *rubber* (not *Indian-rubber*) as we do, though *eraser* may also be heard in both countries *Espantoon* is a Baltimore word, I think, certainly it is not general in this country P 475 the *NED* says that *serviette* "has come to be considered vulgar" and Wyld marks it "vulg" in his Universal Dict. The standard English word is *napkin* P 477 the English now usually say *ground-nut* for our *peanut* P 479 in London *lavatory* is the official name for a public toilet and I have never heard it called "public convenience" P 480 instead of *char-a-banc* the English sometimes say *motorcoach* P 481 my experience has been that the English say *scrambled eggs* just as we do The word *semester* should be added here to the list of Americanisms, the English say *term* (as we do too, of course) The *DAE* records *blind* in the sense 'window shade (on rollers)' and gives several quotations for it, including one from Mark Twain My own word is *shade*, but I have heard Americans say *blind* See also *PADS* No 5, p 11, and No 8, pp 31 and 37 P 482 in Richmond, Va and perhaps elsewhere *pavement* is current in the sense 'sidewalk' P 487 the British pronunciation of *geyser* should be given P 488 the English spell *check* as we do unless it is a check on a bank P 513 for advertently read inadvertently P 568 *phrase* needs no *so*, see *Hamlet* II, ii, 111 P 641 *vespasienne* is feminine in metropolitan France as well as in Canada

SUPPLEMENT II

P 4 the English stress the first, not the second syllable of *deficit*, *compensate*, *confiscate*, and *demonstrate* Pp 10 (thrice) and 12 (once) for Anglian read Anglian P 17, n. 4 most of the stage pronunciations

referred to as "curious specimens" are perfectly genuine old pronunciations which survived on the stage after they had been given up by the general public. One of them (*rallery* for *railery*) is marked by the *NED* as "esp U S". For *mourn* see *MLN* XLVI 470 ff. P 28, n 2 for Vol II read Vol I. P 32 here and elsewhere the author speaks of "long a" when he seems to mean [a] or [ɑ], not [e] or [ei]. P 36 Colby's *disahster* is right, since the next word begins with a vowel, his *aghist*, however, should be *agahst*. P 38, line 24 for verbs read vowels. The statements of Bridges about the vowels of unstressed syllables should not have been taken seriously, Mencken is wrong in supposing that the "neutral" vowel of such syllables is restricted, in this country, to "the Northeastern seaboard and the South". It is general, of course, and I can bear witness to the fact that Mencken himself uses it. P 44, line 18 for *departs* read *depart*. P 54, line 5 for diphones read allophones. P 70 the great vowel shift took place about 1400, not 1500. P 72 another case of short *e* for long is the first *e* of *lever*. I heard it pronounced short by a colleague at Cornell in 1916, and got the shock of my life, since then I have learned that that is the usual Northern pronunciation, though we Southerners continue to use long *e*, as do the British. P 73 *habit* is an unhappy illustration here, *terrible* would do better, as its *r* really is "reduced to a grunt". P 74 here the author's "long *g*" means [ɑ] in *charm*, *calm* but [ɔ] in *salt*, *walk*. P 75 here "broad *a*" means [ɔ], according to D Jones, the English use [ɔ] by preference in *Albany* and *Raleigh*, though the bicycle is pronounced [rəbi] P 76 for *gagen* read *gagan*. P 79 D Jones and Seaman do not agree on the pronunciation of *stern*. P 81, line 3 from bottom for given read giving.

Pp. 122 f. the familiar Southern voiced *s* in *greasy* and *blouse* is hardly a usage "borrowed from below". It is simply standard speech in the South as in England. Nor is the so-called dropping of the *g* a vulgarism in origin, the *-in* forms go back to the Middle Ages and have been used ever since by all levels of the population, though they now belong to colloquial style in those regions where they survive. P 123 *don't* for *doesn't* may well be "phonological". Compare the now obsolete *in't* for *isn't*. P 165 the *yi* and *wi* of the paradigm presumably reproduce the short vowel, not *ee* as Mencken supposes. P 171 the name *Shands* is here misspelt *Shand*, elsewhere (pp 354 and 544, as well as in the index) it appears as *Shanks*. P 172 though I am a native of Mississippi, *jummy jawed* is not familiar to me, but it is familiar to my wife, who was born and brought up in Richmond, Va. P 195 *egal* is the old form of the word, *equal* is a modern latinization of it. As for *buer*, this seems to answer to French *beurre*, certainly it can hardly be called a "curious pronunciation" of *butter*. P 234 the reference for Kenny's paper is wanting. P 242, line 29 the printer seems to have got into trouble here.

P 284 *installment* is out of place here, as the *ll* appears in *install*, the British write *instalment* (contrary to Websterian precept) because they write *instal* (or used to). In other words, a suffix which begins with a consonant does not cause doubling. P 285 the noun *practise* is a noun use of the verb, it does not "descend from an earlier *practic*" but

replaced *practic* The verb was taken from French, where it has now died out, having been replaced by *pratiquer* P 286 British spelling is used in the magazine *Vogue* P 314 *desert* (verb) and *dessert* are surely homonyms in "General American" as well as in British use, or, rather, they are homophones P 319 *for* *force* read *fou* P 359 *dampened* is not a dialectal form P 360 *dove* is not an old preterit, but an analogical formation P 362 *wohen* is standard English P 364 the discussion of *used to* is unsatisfactory, in particular, Mencken seems to think that the pronunciation [ju stə] is dialectal, whereas it is actually standard both in America and in England P 366 *for habben* read *habban* P 369, n 5, line 4 *for* plural read pronoun P 372 we have no reason to think that French *c'est moi* had anything to do with the rise of English *it is me* or Danish *det er mig*

P 410 the change of *Kaufmann* to *Coffman* does not exemplify the change of *au* to *aw* P 416, n 3, line 2 *for* in read is P 470 nine presidents (not three) had "surnames as given names," though perhaps Wilson should not be counted, as *Woodrow* was only his middle name P 479 *Keturah*, the name of one of Abraham's wives, is out of place in a list of invented names P. 497 *Thusnelda*, the name of the wife of Arminius, the greatest of all Germanic heroes, is a fine old historical name, even if one little used nowadays P 590 the author here shows himself strangely confused about the Trinity, *Emmanuel* names the Second, not the First Person, and *Holy Spirit* is the name of the Third Person, not the Second P 591 the Methodists (though not the other denominations mentioned) use saints' names freely, as also names like *Trinity*

During the period under review Numbers 3 to 10 of the *Publication of the American Dialect Society* (abbreviated *PADS*) came out¹³ Of these, No. 4 is not linguistic and will not be considered here. The main item in No. 3 (pp 13-28) is a paper by L. D. Turner on the sounds and vocabulary of Gullah, Professor Turner contributes another paper on Gullah in No. 9 (pp. 74-84). Of the many writers on this subject, he is the first to come to his task with the needful scientific equipment a good knowledge of general linguistics, an acquaintance with the history of the Negro slave trade, and a familiarity with the West African tongues native to the slaves imported from overseas In consequence, his studies of Gullah are the only ones in print which have much scientific value We look forward with interest to the monograph on Gullah which he hopes soon to publish.

¹³ No. 3, 1945, pp 28, No. 4, 1945, pp 25, No. 5, 1946, pp 46, No. 6, 1946, pp 46, No. 7, 1947, pp 255, No. 8, 1947, pp 41; No. 9, 1947, pp 89, No. 10, 1948, pp 82 All to be had from Prof. G. P. Wilson, secretary of the Society, Woman's Coll. of Univ. of N. C., Greensboro, N. C.

No 5 is devoted chiefly to a glossary of Virginia words, by Phyllis J. Nixon (pp 7-43), with an important programmatic preface of four pages by Hans Kuath. In No 6 (pp 44-46), B. J. Whiting has listed those words of Miss Nixon's glossary which are likewise current in Waldo Co., Maine. To the same number C. M. Woodard contributes a word-list from Virginia and North Carolina (pp. 4-43).

No 7 is given over to *The Place-Names of Dane Co., Wisconsin*, by F. G. Cassidy (pp 8-251), the first full-fledged monograph published by the Society since its reorganization. Professor R. L. Ramsay, who has done so much for place-name study in this country, contributes an appreciative foreword to Mr Cassidy's monograph. This falls into three parts: an introduction (pp 9-41), a list of sources (pp 42-58), and a list of the place-names investigated, with comments on each (pp. 59-251). The author shows himself a well-trained, competent investigator; there is nothing amateurish about his work. As Ramsay says in his foreword, "any worth-while study of place-names must be a combination of geography, history, and linguistics." The present study fulfils these requirements admirably, and one can only hope that our graduate schools train many more like Cassidy. I find very little indeed to quarrel with in his book. *Morland Terrace* (pp 33, 169) is not a back formation but rather an abstraction from the earlier *Westmorland*, and it will hardly do to make the velar *n* of *Wingra* secondary (p 33), as the etymology throws no light on the matter and the dental *n* may be the one of secondary origin.

No 8 consists of two main items: a paper on maple-sugar language in Vermont (pp 3-10), by Margaret M. Bryant, and a number of short word-lists by various contributors, lists supplementary to those given in *PADS* 5 and 6. Besides Mr Turner's contribution, mentioned above, No 9 includes "Oil Refinery Terms in Oklahoma," by A. T. King (pp 3-64), and a nine-page account of an "Experiment in State-wide Dialect Collecting," by E. H. Criswell. No 10 analyses "An Iowa Low German Dialect." The author, Mr A. P. Kehlenbeck, gives us a systematic account, taking up in seven chapters (preceded by a two-page introduction) the historical background, the phonology, the morphology, the word order, the English loan words, four short texts in phonetic transcription (with translations), and the vocabulary (a list of about

2300 words with English glosses) A noteworthy feature of the phonology of the dialect is the six consonantal phonemes with binal intonation Since intonation normally implies tone, one is curious to know how the three surd phonemes [t, s, ʃ] manage to get pronounced with "rise-fall intonation" The binal character of the three nasals (in their cases "fall-rise intonation") makes less trouble for the analyst The use of the term *vowel* as synonymous with *sonant* (i.e. syllabic sound) is unfortunate, as the author unwittingly makes clear (p. 12 bottom) Elsewhere, as on p. 13, he uses better terminology, though his *sonantic* is not wholly satisfactory, *sonantal* would be preferable by virtue of the parallel with *consonantal*

Professor Stewart's book¹⁴ has for sub-title "A Historical Account of Place-naming in the United States" The author is not a professional linguist and his book is popular rather than technical in purpose, but he has done with success what he set out to do, namely, "to present the process of naming" (p. 387) He tells the story of our name-giving as part of the history of the country, of course, and makes it come alive. He obviously did much study of a technical character to prepare himself for his task, and I find no serious deficiencies in his treatment of the subject The most conspicuous omission, perhaps, is that of *Dixie*, a regional name mentioned indeed (p. 385) but not discussed The following comments are presented for what they are worth.

P. 21 *meadow* is a native English word, and *creek* may be, see P. H. Reaney, *Place-Names of Cambridgeshire*, pp. 254 ff. P. 35 the author here departs from his normal chronological account of events in order to make New England follow Virginia, whereas in fact New York should have second place P. 66 *Namalake* lost its *Na-* not "by some great twist" but by the familiar process known as apheresis P. 83 *Niagara* goes back directly to *Ongmaahra*, not by way of *Ongara* P. 112 the *Shell-* of *Shellpot* is merely a translation of Swedish *Skull-* P. 114 here *Harford* Co., Md. might have been mentioned, the name answers to English *Hereford* P. 128 *Blewing* for *Blue Wing* is an unconventional but not a "phonetic spelling" The spelling *Ozark*, however (p. 137), is phonetic as well as unconventional P. 150 *Teeny* is not a bad spelling, see the dictionaries The author seems to have thought it a misspelling (and mispronunciation) of *tiny* P. 151 the form *Lulbegrund* presumably started not as a spelling but as a pronunciation, to which the spelling conformed

¹⁴ G. R. Stewart, *Names on the Land* Random House New York, 1945
Pp. x + 418 \$3

P 252 *Grenada*, though mentioned, is not classified, it obviously echoes the name of the British colony in the West Indies, cf Jamaica, N Y and Trinidad, Colquado P 274 the *Bel* of *Belmont* is a masculine, not a feminine form, Shakespeare's use of *Belmont* in *The Merchant of Venice* may have given it the preference over *Beaumont*

Mr Hamill Kenny's big book¹⁵ obviously involved much hard work, and the author's zeal and industry are to be commended. Pages 1-65 make an "introductory essay," falling into three parts: an introduction proper (pp 1-30), a description of "materials and methods" (pp 30-48), and a section called "philology" (pp. 48-65). If one may judge by the matters discussed under the last head, the author uses *philology* in a sense not easy to define, he includes under it (A) phonology, (B) the current pronunciation of West Virginia place names, a list of specimens only, (C) the change of place names, (D) the synthetic place name, and (E) place name vocabulary (subdivided into fauna, flora, and topography). To Mr Hamill, it would seem, *philology* means 'word-lore' or the like. This meaning is not recognized in the dictionaries, though the *College Standard* of 1947 comes close to it in its third definition: "In popular use, etymology." I have the impression that 'word-lore' is the most prevalent meaning of *philology* today, although never before, so far as I know, has it got into learned writing. Certainly the dictionaries are at fault in not recognizing this meaning. The main body of Mr Hamill's book consists, of course, of an alphabetical list of place names, each discussed more or less (pp 71-698). There follows a bibliography (pp 699-720), and the work is ended with a list of the maps consulted (pp 721-730) and an index.

The faults of this book are those of the amateur. It would be impossible in the space at my disposal to list, much less to discuss, the many details which need correction, and I shall restrict myself here to a few of the mistakes in a single department, that of pronunciation. Secondary stress is not infrequently marked where such a stress seems incredible. I do not believe, for instance, that the last syllable of *American* has secondary stress (p 50). The symbol for rhotacized schwa is used (as on p 50) without explanation, no

¹⁵ *West Virginia Place Names, their Origin and Meaning, Including the Nomenclature of the Streams and Mountains*. The Place Name Press, Piedmont, W Va., 1945. Pp xii + 768.

such symbol appears in the table on p. 69. The variation between *Abram* and *Abrams* in the name *Abram Creek* is morphological, not phonetic (p. 51), and the same applies to the other examples of the "omission of *s*" which the author gives. *Track* for *tract* does not exemplify "the substitution of *k* for *t*" (p. 52), here the author is misled by the spelling. *Lunice* is not an unvoiced variant of *Looney* (p. 53), perhaps the author means that *Lunice* arose by unvoicing the last phoneme of *Looney's*. The variation between *d* and *t* spellings in words like *Cassidy* hardly reflects any actual difference in the pronunciation (p. 53). Such slips indicate that the author is not at home in the phonetics of his native tongue, or in linguistics generally.

Dr. M. M. Mathews in his lectures on *Some Sources of Southernisms*¹⁶ takes up three sources: "The Nahuatl Contribution to Southern Speech" (pp. 1-41), "Some Muskhogean Words in the Southern Vocabulary" (pp. 42-85), and "Africanisms in the Plantation Vocabulary" (pp. 86-129). There follow 17 pages of notes, an index of words, and a subject index. The first lecture has no proper place in the series, as the words there taken up are nearly all western rather than southern, in so far as they have a regional character at all. The lectures were designed for a popular audience and make pleasant reading. The author's lively personality comes out in this book as in everything he does. Mathews is an old hand in the lexical field, and his etymological lore is up to date. Now and then, however, like everybody else, he makes slips. Thus, it was Paul, not Peter (p. 4), who preached on Mars Hill, and *shack* can hardly come from Mexican Spanish *jacal* (p. 41), for another etymology of *shack* see the *ACD*. Of special interest are the author's discussions of *benne* and *cush* (pp. 115 ff.), though one does not see why *benne* could not be Malay in origin after all.

During the period under review the Linguistic Society of America has published three language monographs and four language dissertations,¹⁷ and four more volumes of the great Danish dictionary

¹⁶ Dancy Lectures, Fourth Series. Univ. of Alabama Press. University, Ala., 1948. Pp. [xii] + 154. \$2.50.

¹⁷ Language Monographs 22 to 24, Baltimore 1945-1948. C. F. Voegelin and Z. S. Harris, *Index to the Franz Boas Collection of Materials for American Linguistics*, pp. 43; Martin Joos, *Acoustic Phonetics*, pp. 136; Robert A. Hall, Jr., *French*, pp. 56. Language Dissertations 39 to 42, Baltimore 1946-1948. W. E. Welmers, *A Descriptive Grammar of Fanti*,

have come out¹⁸ This work is now rapidly nearing its conclusion Here should also be mentioned Peter Skautrup's big history of the Danish language, two volumes of which have already appeared¹⁹ The author writes well, and his book comes alive as a narrative of events, something not always to be found in works of this kind

The sixth volume of the late Otto Jespersen's English grammar²⁰ deals with morphology and was originally planned as Vol II of the series (see the Preface of that volume) The text lay unfinished for many years, it was at last completed and made ready for publication with the help of three disciples of the old master, one of whom, Niels Halslund, did the "lion's share of the whole" (p. iii) The treatment of modern English morphology here given is by far the best we have The following notes may prove useful for a second edition of the volume

P 10 the *s* of the 2d sing in Tennyson's Northern Farmer (e.g. *thou knowest*) is not "the *s* of the third person singular extended to all forms of the present" but is the ancient *s* ending of the 2d sing, recorded in northern OE and still used in northern dialect speech P 31 the *a* of the last syllable of *kidnapped* and *handicapped* is not an "unstressed vowel," although it does not take the main stress P 32 *wont* 'accustomed' still has, in this country, the historically correct pronunciation [want] P 34 *bet* is not "from OF" but is a native English word, see *Studier i modern Sprakvetenskap* xvii 96 P 41 *fly* for *flee* is archaic in American use P 51 the *o* of *shone* is usually [ou] in current American speech P 59 the forms *born* and *borne* are distinguished in pronunciation as well as spelling by many millions of English-speaking people P 64 the past participle *woken*, though perfectly good British English, is not used in America P 75 *yede* goes back not to OE *ēode* but to OE *getode* P 97 *winged* means 'deprived of the use of the wings' and thus goes with *pinion* etc on p. 95, where, besides, *cruñb* and *shell* might have been mentioned Pp 98-99 *father, baby, cook, nurse, etc.* are

pp. 78, B. Schwartz, *The Root and its Modification in Primitive Indo-European*, pp. 67, C. T. Hodge, *An Outline of Hausa Grammar*, pp. 61; E. G. Zenn, *The Neuter Plural in Latin Lyric Verse*, pp. 20

¹⁸ *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, udgivet af Det danske Sprog og Litteraturselskab 21. Bind, sort-stivøjlet, 1943, pp. 738, 22. Bind, stjaalen-synkning, 1944, pp. 763, 23. Bind, synlig tøjle, 1946, pp. 781, 24. Bind, tja-tæve, 1948, pp. 746. Copenhagen

¹⁹ *Det danske Sprogs Historie* vol. I (beginnings to 1350), pp. x + 352, vol. II (1350-1700), pp. vi + 455. Copenhagen. Gyldendal, 1944-1947

²⁰ *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, Part VI, Morphology. Written with the assistance of Paul Christophersen, Niels Halslund, and Knud Schibbye. Ejnar Munksgaard. Copenhagen, 1942. Pp. x + 570

hardly names of persons, though they may be so used P 109 *hook it* 'make off' goes back to ME P 110 *bested* in the quotation from Scott means 'pressed' and has no connection with *best* P 120 add the noun pair *meet meeting* P 124 in this country one says "sit-down strike" rather than "stay in strike"

P 133 to the discussion of *chance* should be added a cross reference to p 275 P 134 top with "steady does it" should be compared "dogged does it" P 142 under Substantive compounds the type *sledgehammer* should be included P 169 *blindfold* goes back to OE *blindfellan*, a denominative formation, the substantive *blindfell*, literally blind fall, is not recorded but is to be inferred from the existence of the verb The word is not connected with *fellan* 'to fell' P 185 *Norman* takes an *s* plural even though its *-man* means 'man' P 192 the old noun *coss* 'kiss' survives in the derivative *cosset* P 203 some Americans, but certainly not many, use [s] in the noun *risc* P 209 here and elsewhere the word *different* is used unidiomatically P 211 the author's query, "Why not *gangsterocracy* to describe present conditions?", was written and published in Denmark during the German occupation and obviously refers to the Hitler regime Luckily it slipped past the censorship P 213 *spandy*, though marked "esp U S" is not familiar to me P 217 for *Pragy Wilson* read simply *prery*, this word is a derivative of the older *prea* 'president,' a blend of *president* and *rex* P 220 *greed* is not a back formation from *greedy* but goes back to OE *grād*, a noun which occurs in the dat plur (used adverbially) Along with *mopsy* and the like should have been mentioned *dory* (i.e. *dolsy*), for the etymology of which see the ACD P 226 OE *hunta* survives as the surname *Hunt* P 228 *layer* in my pronunciation is [leɪə], whatever the meaning P 230 *furnitor* 'seller of furniture' is not familiar to me P 234 the etymology given for *ream* is unlikely, since ME *romen* seems to have had an open vowel P 238 *beg* goes back to OE *bedecian*, and is therefore not a back formation from *beggar* (earlier *begge*), on the contrary, *beggar* is a derivative of *beg* See E Ekwall, *English Studies* XVIII 66

P 240 ~~*myster*~~ should be *myster*, Jespersen had it right in *Linguistica*, p 426 P 241 *sophister* is not used in American universities, though it is used in Trinity College, Dublin The American word is *sophomore* The verb *quaver* is best explained as a blend of *quake* and *waver* P 251 "The suffix has long ago ceased to be used" This can be turned into good English by canceling the *has* Similarly on p 541 P 266 the voicing of *-s* took place in (not after) a weak syllable, Jespersen has this wrong in *Linguistica* too P 267 (16 63) for follow read end P 313 OE *abbod* cannot go back to "Romanic *abbē*," as the vocalism shows P 321 for better explanations of *astonish* and *distinguish*, see the ACD P 340 top *Halloween* should be added P 342 *lunch* in U S also means 'the ordinary midday meal,' and differs from *luncheon* only in style P 366 bottom the American words in *-ine* here listed all have [-i n], not [in] P 372 *brilliance* is still in active use P 373 *punition* is hardly used nowadays P 386 *cleric* as a noun is not archaic P 393 *rheumatism* is still used in popular American speech. P 396 ME *rakel*

by popular misinterpretation gave *rakehell* P 443 Jespersen might have mentioned also the native suffix *et*, as in *thicket* P 463 there is no reason to think that *-ock* was originally diminutive, for this suffix and *-ton*, see the *ACD* P 532 the prefix *arch-* is not from OF, as Jespersen himself points out, it goes back to OE, see the *ACD* P 550 *Betty, Bessy* and the like are not properly explained as "small children's mispronunciation"

The third edition of Professor Zandvoort's *Handbook* ²¹ differs from the first and the second almost wholly in the part devoted to verbs, which takes up pp 7-102 as compared to pp 7-65 of the first two editions. The other seven parts (on nouns, pronouns, sentence structure, order of words, concord, and word formation), and the appendix, are substantially the same in all three editions. The third edition, however, has a four-page index wanting in the earlier editions. The changes in the part about verbs do not involve any differences in organization, we have rather a greater fulness in the material treated. The book is designed for Dutch students and nearly all the examples given are translated into Dutch. The author is known for his mastery of the English language and his book is written in an English which would do credit to a native. The scope of the book is restricted to morphology and syntax, but the inflexional side of morphology is taken up along with the syntax of the three parts of speech treated (noun, verb, and pronoun), whereas word formation has a part to itself, although this part includes a chapter on comparison. This chapter ends with a somewhat apologetic mention of comparatives other than that of superiority, to which almost the whole of the chapter had been devoted. The author would have done better to see and treat comparison as a whole, instead of concentrating his fire on one particular kind of comparison. Such an approach would, besides, have kept him from taking up comparison under the head of word formation, an unhappy way of apprehending this feature of English grammar.

The author has done well, I think, in holding fast to much of the traditional terminology of grammar, although in some quarters he has been criticized for so doing. His *Handbook* is a masterpiece of lucid condensation, with an abundance of apt illustration. The following observations may prove of use for the fourth edition.

P 12 *I hear say* does not sound natural to me (though the noun *hearsay* is current enough) and *we have heard tell* strikes me as a bit

²¹ R. W. Zandvoort, *A Handbook of English Grammar* J. B. Wolters' Uitgeversmaatschappij Groningen, 1948 Pp 377 F 950

on the archaic side. *Let* may also be combined with *drop* and *pass*. P. 13: the word order exemplified in Sec. 19 belongs to literary style only. P. 30: in the first example under Sec. 59 the *for* is needed because of the position of *very much*. P. 32: in the U. S. *Chrysler* has [s], not [z]. P. 36: *stopped* sounds to me more natural than *ceased* in *The works have ceased running*. P. 40: in the same way, *keep* is better than *prevent*; after it, *from* is required in the example given (though not, of course, if *prevent* is used). P. 47, line 31: *for* single *read* simple. P. 67: *The book became widely read . . .* sounds unidiomatic to me; I should prefer *came to be*. P. 76 bottom: the spelling *cannot* was formerly the rule in America too, and most people, I think, still follow it. P. 84: the quotation from Lowes is not a model of felicitous English, and the changed form of it (p. 85 top) is even worse. Pp. 99-102: the use of *mood* for *mode* as a grammatical term seems to me unfortunate.

P. 118: I see no objection to saying *Is this umbrella father's?* P. 125, line 1: *for* a multiple of *read* greater than. P. 136: to my feeling, the article in *the cruel Macbeth* makes the adjective no more emphatic than a simple *cruel* would be. Pp. 146 and 253: the discussion divided between sections 359 and 661 might with profit have been concentrated in Sec. 359. P. 157: in the examples under Sec. 394, *ours* and *whose* belong to formal style, as they stand. In ordinary speech one would say, *our clock is the only one . . .* and *whose umbrella is this?* P. 167: in spoken English of *whom* would hardly occur at all. Pp. 180 ff.: relative *who* and *which* tend to be avoided in colloquial style, though of course not so much so as *whom*. Pp. 227 ff.: the author makes no use of the classification *complex* sentence; he recognizes only *simple* and *compound*. P. 243 top: to my feeling, the example given should end with *would they?* not *wouldn't they?* P. 255: the second *there* in the example given in 665.2 need not be pronounced with the fuller form. P. 259 top: *I gave it him* rarely occurs in American English; we say, *I gave it to him*. P. 263, note 1: *a boy of ten years old* is stigmatized by the *COD* as a "mixed construction" and does not sound natural to me. P. 272: in America, at least, *says I* (though not *says he*) is a vulgarity. P. 290: in the discussion of *British* the nouns *Briton* and *Britisher* might have been mentioned. P. 335: the literary character of adjectives in *-ian* also appears from such modifications of the stem as are found in *Shavian*, etc. P. 346: *elder* is used to translate *presbyter*. P. 353: in America the usual pronunciation of *bade* is [bæd]. P. 369: it is an oversimplification to dispose of the future tense in American usage by saying that "*will* is used in all persons."

Dr R. W. Chapman's *Lexicography*²² was designed for a semi-popular audience. Its beginning may serve as a sample of its quality:

The subject of my choice has the merit of universal appeal. Everyone is

²² The James Bryce Memorial Lecture (Somerville College, Oxford). Oxford Univ. Press: London, New York, Toronto, 1948. Pp. 34. \$0.75.

interested in words, and therefore in dictionaries Happily however, most people are almost ignorant of lexicography

This lightness of touch is kept up to the end The author nevertheless has seriousness enough behind his quips and cranks and wanton wiles His prejudices may irritate some (e g the pseudo-quotation ' Oliver Cromwell was a Hitler ' on p 28), but he shows wisdom too, and in abundance He calls himself a traditionalist (p 18), but when it comes to lexicography he proves a reformer of a radical stripe And he makes a plausible case for the innovations which he proposes No dictionary-maker should fail to read and ponder this lecture I comment on one detail only the spelling *makeable* (p 28) would have horrified Fowler, whom the author professes to admire.

Dr Lofvenberg's monograph of 1946²³ is a fine piece of work, which workers in Middle English will neglect at their peril By study of the Calendar of Close Rolls for the years 1272-1435 the author has gleaned many words not recorded at all in the *NED*, besides earlier examples of words there recorded. In connection with these gleanings he advances a number of etymologies, correcting the *NED* now and again

Under *Fleming* (p 6) he might have mentioned Chaucer's use of the word in *C T*, B 4586 Under *croplung* (p 8) he cites but does not discuss *tithing*, the etymology of which is inadequately explained in the *NED* It is tempting to take Cornish *pillas* (p 14) as English in origin, as it answers to early ME *pilate* 'pilled oats' in form and meaning alike, one of the features of Cornish is the sound-change *t > s* But R Williams in his *Lexicon Cornu-Britannicum* has an entry "*piles* adj bare, bald," and quotes from Pryce's *Vocabulary* the following "A certain kind of oats are called *pillas*, because it has no husks" The author is undoubtedly right in taking the *fell* of *foot-fell* to represent OE *fell* 'a falling, fall' (p. 20) He might have compared the OE denominative verb *blindfellen*, see my discussion above In his discussion of *falding* the author makes needless difficulties over MÍrish *fallaing* 'mantle' (p 36 footnote) This word (the modern form of which is *falaing*, not *fallung*) is best taken as of English origin, that is, as the Irish form of E *falding* The sound-shift *ld > ll* is characteristic of MÍrish, see R Thurneysen, *Handbuch*, p 91 The second *a* of *fallaing* is only a graphic device to mark the *ll* as not palatalized Dinneen is a better source of information than Macbain when it comes to modern Irish In view of ME *oversloppe* the single *p* of

²³ M. T. Lofvenberg, *Contributions to Middle English Lexicography and Etymology* Lunds Universitets Årsskrift N F Avd 1 Bd 41 Nr 8

OE *oferstop* need not be taken too seriously; double consonants were often written only once in final position (p. 42).

Dr Löfvenberg's doctoral dissertation likewise comes within the scope of this survey; it is the first of the five volumes of the *Lund Studies in English* that came out, or became available, during the period which we are treating.²⁴ His study of local surnames may be looked upon as a kind of sequel to G. Fransson's study of occupational surnames (see *MLN* LIII 31), and to G. Tengvik's study of Old English bynames (see *MLN* LVII 129). It is restricted to cases in which the true name is qualified by a prepositional phrase, with a place name as the object of the preposition. Moreover, even with this restriction the material in the records proved so abundant that only four countries could be investigated: Sussex, Surrey, Somerset, and Worcestershire. As the author points out, his results are of the greatest interest, not only for the etymology of English surnames, but also for English lexicography and for place-name study proper. He has harvested a rich crop. The following notes may be useful by way of supplement and correction of sundry details.

P. xlii: for guttural read velar. P. xliii: on the sound-change *ēa* > *i*, see my paper in the *Jespersen Miscellany* (1930), p. 52 top. P. 2: the OE suffix *-et* was used to make a collective noun in *piccet* as well as in *pyrnet*. P. 3: *nappes* is surely only a miswriting of *nappse*. P. 6: OE *bealluc* means not 'little ball' but 'ball-like object.' In the same way *wennok* (p. 226) means 'wen-like object'—in this case an object far bigger than a wen. See my paper in *Arkiv för nordisk Filologi* LXI 284. Pp. 37 and 125: on forms like *Clouford* and *launde* see *MP* xx 189 ff. Pp. 46 and 134: the loss of the first *t* in words like *cotstedel* and *motstow* is hardly due to dissimilation, since *t* might be lost in the combination *ts* in any case, witness *bless*; the phonetic change is rather an example of assimilation, followed by simplification. P. 67: *flodgate* cannot go back to an OE *flodgeat*, which would give ME *flodyat*. One must start with OE plural *flodgatu*, the stopped *g* of which in this case was presumably extended to the singular. Similarly with *Gate* (p. 75) and elsewhere. P. 81: in spite of the author, the *-et* of *grafet* 'grove' is not diminutive.

²⁴ XI: M. T. Löfvenberg, *Studies on Middle English Local Surnames* (1942), pp. xlviii + 255; XII: J. Hedberg, *The Syncope of Old English Present Endings* (1945), pp. 310; XIII: A. Rynell, *The Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English* (1948), pp. 431; XIV: H. Hallqvist, *Studies in Old English Fractured ea* (1948), pp. 168; XV: G. Forsström, *The Verb 'To be' in Middle English* (1948), pp. 237. All published by C. W. K. Gleerup, Lund, Sweden.

Since *graf* is itself a collective noun, the collective suffix *-et* was presumably added to intensify the collective meaning, in other words, *-et* is here an intensive suffix P 83 the reading *grove* is wrongly marked with a "sic" The *o* here stands for [ø], as does the *eo* of the 1333 reading

P 85 the author's discussion of *guzzle* n is not satisfactory He shows that this noun is used as a place name as early as the thirteenth century, and he rightly concludes that this use reflects some such meaning as the 'drain, gutter' recorded for *guzzle* in the sixteenth century This is obviously the oldest meaning we have for the word, and the author, proceeding on this assumption, gives us a plausible etymology for *guzzle* as a native English word But he is surely wrong in dissociating the meanings 'drain, gutter' from the meaning 'throat' recorded for *guzzle* in the seventeenth century This meaning could readily arise from an older 'channel' or the like, and drains and gutters are certainly channels for water, much as is the human throat The *NED* hazards the guess (qualified by a question mark) that *guzzle* n is from *guzzle* v, but this is clearly wrong, as the noun is some 300 years older than the verb It seems more reasonable to say that *guzzle* v is a verb use of *guzzle* n in its late meaning 'liquor, drink,' a meaning readily explicable from the earlier 'throat,' the container by a familiar figure of speech being used for the thing contained The *NED* hesitatingly connects *guzzle* v with OF *gosiller* 'to vomit,' but this connection makes serious semantic difficulties and cannot be upheld

P 126 the first element of *lovecote* may go back to OE *lufen* (see *Beowulf* 2886), which, if Hoops is right, means 'home' P 130 *Merk* presumably goes back to the dialectal OE *merc*, a variant of *mearc* The *e* of this *merc* is not mutational, of course P 150 the author marks OE *peose* with an asterisk, but Clark Hall records this form (perhaps mistakenly) P 156 the first element of *Pievell* may be OE *preg* 'pointed stick' P 193 in view of Icel *snapi* 'sea' (poet), the English dialectal *snape* 'spring' presumably goes back to a masc, not a fem OE weak noun P 194 the second element of *garsecg* answers to Icel *seggr* 'man,' not to *saggi* 'moisture,' as the mutation shows See my paper in *English Studies* xxviii 42 ff P 196 for contamination read blend

Dr Hedberg's dissertation has for sub-title "A Dialect Criterion." The author explains it as follows (p 7)

The exact picture of the Old English dialects may perhaps never be satisfactorily drawn, but if that end is envisaged it is necessary to search the Old English sources in order to ascertain the value of the points on which the dialectal differences rest So far it looks as if none of the dialect criteria that stalk Old English linguistics has been made the subject of a systematic and complete investigation This thesis purposes to give a full treatment of one dialect criterion the syncope of the vowel in the second and third persons singular of the present indicative in all strong verbs and in weak verbs of Class I

The author has listed and counted all occurrences of both syncopated and unsyncopated forms (within the limits stated above) in the OE prose texts which are available in print. He has analyzed his material with care, and has given us a definitive treatment of the subject. As might have been expected, his results serve chiefly to confirm our previous information. As he sums the matter up (p. 298), "the unsyncopated form was as typically Anglian as the syncopated form was West Saxon and Kentish." Unluckily the evidence fails either to prove or to disprove the theory of A. Walde that "the syncopated forms arose from cases with the pronouns *ðu, he, heo, hit* enclitically attached to the verb" (p. 282). As a by-product of his investigation the author has brought out certain stylistic distinctions between unsyncopated and syncopated forms, distinctions which cannot be discussed here but which have importance for all students of Old English literature. He has also found additional evidence for the early leveling of unstressed vowels (see esp. p. 289). The page reference 000 on p. 288 should be 294, on p. 293 it should be 290.

Dr. Rynell has likewise made a statistical study of his material, though in his case for obvious reasons completeness was out of the question. He chose for study 102 pairs of synonyms, one member of each pair being a Scandinavian word current in Middle English, the other member a word inherited by Middle English from Old English times, and not of Scandinavian origin. The occurrences of these synonyms in 46 chosen Middle English texts were then determined, the statistics for each word in each text being given separately. Of the 46 texts, 10 were northern, 10 east midland, 17 west midland, and 9 southern. This classification, however, is to be taken in a strictly geographical sense, without much regard to the ME dialects commonly so named. Thus, the *Proverbs of Alfred* (MS Trin Coll Camb 323), though described as "largely West Midland" (p. 256), is reckoned southern for the purposes of the author's investigation.

Two of the synonyms studied, *taken* and *nimen*, are given much closer attention throughout than are the other words included. For each of their occurrences the attempt is made to determine the exact shade of meaning intended, and this sometimes involves a good deal of discussion. By way of supplement the author gives us an "excursus on *nema* and *taka* in Old Scandinavian" (pp. 365-

412). The whole is concluded with a 14-page bibliography, a list of abbreviations, and a table of contents. The investigation proper begins on p. 57, the first 56 pages being given over to introductory matters and to etymological and lexical notes on "OE *nman* and OSn *taka*," together with a 12-page section headed "first occurrences of late OE *tacan* and early ME *taken*," in which the relevant passages are quoted and discussed.

The author has done a careful and useful piece of work. As he points out, studies like his may be expected to "yield valuable information on the distribution of these words in Middle English" and thereby make a much needed contribution to English "word-geography" (p. 8). In addition, the origin of words of disputed etymology may be determined by a study of their distribution. Thus, the verb *call* in Middle English times had a currency in agreement with the theory (sometimes challenged) that it came from Scandinavian, whereas the cognate OE *ceallan* does not appear in ME at all, the author in his study pairs *callen* with *cleopren*.²⁵

The *Studies* of Dr. Hallqvist deal with the fate of OE short and lengthened *ea* in Middle English, but he includes a few examples of long *ea* as well. The material drawn upon "consists of the most part of place-name forms. . . . A number of literary texts, or rather versions of texts, which may be localized with a tolerable amount of certainty have also been scrutinized" (p. 5). The book falls into six chapters:

- I Spellings Testifying to a Raised Quality of the Diphthong in Southern Dialects
- II Middle English Survival of a Diphthongal Pronunciation
- III Cases of Stress-Shifted *ea*
- IV The Southern Material of OE Fractured *ea* after Initial Palatal Consonant
- V The Northern and Midland Material of WG *a* before *rc*, *rg*, *rh*
- VI OE *bearu* 'grove, wood' as Place-Name Element in England and the Distribution of the Dative Forms *beawe* and **beara*

In general, the author finds a sharp contrast between developments in the north and midlands, on the one hand, and in the south on the other. Thus, to quote (p. 58)

²⁵ F. Holthausen, oddly enough, in his *Ae. ety. Wb.*, fails to mark the *o* of *ceallan* as the palatal which the spelling shows it to be.

That a diphthongal pronunciation of *ea* survived in ME in a number of Southern dialects I look upon as certain, the delayed monophthongization may even have been a common Southern feature

In some cases, however, the special development is restricted to a part of the southern area. Thus, the author concludes that shift of stress from the first to the second component of *ea* was "a very common phenomenon in Devon" (p. 99) and took place, more or less, in the neighboring countries of Cornwall, Somerset and Dorset besides, but is of rare occurrence in the other southern countries and hardly occurs at all in midland and north. He agrees with Morsbach that the Kentish evidence points to a falling diphthong, in other words, that no shift of stress took place in this dialect. The author is reasonably cautious in the use he makes of his difficult and doubtful material, and his conclusions in most cases seem soundly based. When he speaks of "a ME raising of $\ddot{a} > \ddot{o}$ before *l*" (p. 97) he presumably means rounding, if not, I cannot make out his meaning. See my study in *MP* XX 189 ff., where the feature is differently explained.

Dr Forsström has given us "a survey of the forms" of the verb *be* in Middle English, a survey based on "an examination of a large number of localized texts" (p. 17). His results (presented on pp. 215-228) make possible a more precise and accurate picture of the ME forms and their distribution than we have had before. Thus, he corrects in several particulars Brunner's survey of these forms in his *Abriss der me Grammatik*. Dr Forsström's dissertation is a creditable piece of work.

Volumes XV (1943) and XVI (1946) of *Studier i modern Språkvetenskap*²⁶ have reached me since my last survey. Vol. XV was dedicated to the lamented Alfred Nordfält, and includes the sixth and last instalment of his study of French loanwords in Swedish (pp. 9-25). Other linguistic papers in the volume are "On the Development of OE Initial *sc*," by E. Slettengren, "Mittelniederländisch *woepen* . . .," by N. O. Heinertz, and "-y in Billy, etc.," by G. Langenfelt. The first of these is a critique of F. Schubel's paper on the same subject in the *Ekwall Miscellany* of 1942. Vol. XVI includes six linguistic papers: some comments on technical terms in English phonetics, by A. Gabrielson, an attempt

²⁶ Utgivna av Nyfilologiska Sällskapet i Stockholm. Pp. 224 and 176. Kr. 7 each.

to explain why modern French has *que* instead of *comme* in certain constructions, by G Tilander, two papers by N O Heineitz, one on German *werft* and *entwerfen*, the other on Swedish *ranning*, a long article, "The Roots of the Propword *One*," by G Langenfelt, and an etymological discussion of Portuguese *borboleta*, by B Maler. Besides, there is included a charming *causerie* by K Ringenson called "La pomme sterling," in which the pseudo-English *sterling* is traced back to a French personal name *Esterlin*.

Miss Stene's interesting monograph²⁷ has for subtitle "A Study of Linguistic Borrowing in the Process." It was done "between November, 1935, and March, 1937" (p vii), but not given to the printers until three years later, when it was set in type. The war delayed its actual publication for five years longer. The heart of the book is the list of loanwords (in cap 3). The rest is preparatory to the list and commentary on it. The whole falls into 13 chapters, preceded by an introduction and followed by a conclusion, a bibliographical note, and a subject index. In the first chapter, "The identification of foreign words," the author sets up tests to distinguish foreign from native in the Norwegian vocabulary: peculiarities of spelling, of pronunciation, and of correspondence between the two, irregularities in stress and tone, irregularities in inflexion and word-formation, and exotic denotation. Heretofore in such studies (so far as I know) the foreign origin of a word has been got at by historical investigation, not by the use of descriptive techniques. The author deserves credit for expanding the field in which synchronic (as opposed to diachronic) methods of attack may be used, even though the rigor and objectivity of her procedure leave something to be desired.

In her second chapter, "The sound systems of English and Norwegian," she uses a phonemic rather than a strictly phonetic transcription. As she puts it, "only differences that are phonologically significant are recorded" (p 17). Her terminology in describing the phonemes is not always of the best, as she depends on Daniel Jones and his school for her terms. Thus, *plosive* is unsuitable as a name for an English stop, a sound which before a pause often has no explosive release, in American speech, indeed, it

²⁷ Aasta Stene, *English Loan-Words in Modern Norwegian*. Published for the Philological Society [of London]. London and Oslo, 1945. Pp xvi + 222.

commonly lacks an explosive release in intervocalic position as well. Jones himself is forced to classify some stops (e.g. the *c* of *act*) as "incomplete plosive consonants," a terminology of desperation which only makes matters worse. See my discussion of the point on p. 533 above. Again, English *v* is not well described as a fricative (p. 20), and even Jones does not call English *w* a fricative as Miss Stene does (p. 19). Many will likewise deny that "the initial element of English [aɪ] is a pure front vowel" (p. 25), an analysis presumably taken from Jones. But in general the descriptions are well done.

The loanwords themselves are given in the third chapter. According to the author, the material is "divided among 440 main entries, of which some comprise several words in derivative relation" (p. 210). By my own count there are 447 main entries, 442 of which are in the vocabulary proper. The other five are relegated to an appendix because "not formally distinguishable" (p. 78) from native words, though reckoned English loans by virtue of their semantic peculiarities. The total may seem small, but it is not meant to be exhaustive. As the author says, in her conclusion, "Some E word-material that can be met with in N has been excluded deliberately, some has inadvertently not been included" (p. 210). Earlier she points out that she has included only such words as were judged by her to be "in a certain degree of general use." A single occurrence has not justified the inclusion of a word in the material" (p. 32).

The next four chapters take up the spelling, the phonology, the musical accent, and the stress accent of the loanwords listed. Four more chapters deal with "factors that determine the pronunciation," with inflection, with word-formation, and with "the meanings of the English loanwords in Norwegian." The twelfth chapter is devoted to the current contacts of Norwegians with the Anglo-Saxon world, the thirteenth, to the transmission of loanwords in the light of history. I have noted a series of misprints on p. 28, and there is something radically wrong with the text on p. 213.

F. M. Salter's study, *John Skelton's Contribution to the English Language*,²⁸ is an important contribution to English lexicography. It falls into two parts. Part I grew out of the author's study of

²⁸ Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Third Series, Sec. II, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 119-217. Ottawa, 1945.

the unique MS (preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge) of Skelton's translation of the world history of Diodorus Siculus, a MS not yet available in print and therefore (one may presume) not used by the editors of the *NED*. Mr Salter dates the translation *circa* 1485. The main feature of his Part I is a list of words found in Skelton's *Diodorus* but either wanting or misdated in the *NED*. In no less than 816 cases Skelton uses words "ten, twenty, fifty, a hundred, and even three hundred (and more) years earlier than the first dates recorded for these words, or for individual senses of them, by the *NED*" (p. 122). The author also tells us that "Skelton's *Diodorus* is full of words that *NED* records as obsolete long before his time" (p. 123), but unluckily we are not told how many of these words there are, and I have not gone through the list to count them up, nor yet to count up the words wanting in the *NED*. In Part II the author gives us a list of 640 words "already credited by *NED* to Skelton as first user" (p. 185). This study makes it very clear indeed that Skelton was one of the most important early English humanists in one respect at least: as an "enricher" (i. e. latinizer) of the language.

But the author has other contributions to make. In Part I he rightly criticizes A. C. Baugh and W. W. Greg (particularly the latter) for the use they make of the datings of words as given in the *NED*, and he rightly lays stress on "the inaccuracy of our knowledge of the history of the English vocabulary" (p. 123). In Part II he examines a number of the *NED* quotations from Skelton's works, and finds that many of these quotations (125 out of 640) have a wrong line reference, and that many of the works quoted are both inaccurately and inconsistently dated. Of all Skelton's works, *Death of Edward IV* gets the worst treatment when it comes to dating: one word from it is dated 1484, two words 1529, and one word 1559! The author's critique ends, however, with words of praise worth quoting:

It remains, however, a grateful duty to record that if the great *Dictionary* cannot be depended upon in its historical aspects, its virtues in lexicography [i. e. in defining words] are beyond praise. It is only in extremely few cases that I have felt obliged to question *NED*'s interpretation of a passage or its definition of a term. (p. 190)

Mr Salter has himself made only one slip that caught my eye. He includes the noun *wave* in his first list, but his quotation shows that Skelton in fact used *wawe*, the familiar ME noun, now obsolete.

Professors Starnes and Noyes in a happy piece of collaboration²⁹ give us the history of English lexicography in its formative period (up to, but not including, Dr Johnson himself) The volume falls into 22 chapters and three appendices, followed by footnotes (unfortunately put not under the text but after it) and an index I quote from the Foreword

In the division of labor, Mr Starnes is responsible for the [eight] chapters covering the period from 1604 to 1700, and Miss Noyes for the remaining chapters of the text proper Mr Starnes wrote the essay on medieval and Renaissance vocabularies [Appendix I], and Miss Noyes that on cant lexicography [Appendix II] The Bibliography and the Census of English dictionaries in American libraries [Appendix III] are the joint work of the authors

The book is carefully and intelligently done, and will enhance the already excellent reputation of the authors Mr Starnes shows a little weakness, however, in the medieval part of Appendix I He fails to attribute to Ælfric the Latin-English vocabulary commonly known as *Ælfric's Glossary*, having depended on the out-of-date edition of Wright, inadequately revised by Wulcker, instead of using the standard edition of Julius Zupitza, and he is capable of referring to early Middle English as "semi-Saxon" (p 199), a term in use 100 years ago but odd indeed in a book of today Such touches make it plain that he is not really at home in this material, and he would have done better to leave the Middle Ages out of his essay But I do not wish to end on a sour note The book before us is by far the best thing we have in its field and it is not likely to be superseded soon A particularly attractive feature is the 16 plates, eleven of which reproduce as many title-pages of the works treated Authors and publishers alike are to be congratulated on a significant contribution to an important subject

*Plain Words*³⁰ has for subtitle "A Guide to the use of English" and was published in London by His Majesty's Stationery Office The author in his Preface tells us,

This book was written at the invitation of the Treasury
concerned particularly with the use of English by officials

It is con-
cerned With very

²⁹ DeWitt T Starnes and Gertrude E Noyes, *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755* Univ of North Carolina Press Chapel Hill, 1946 Pp xii + 16 [plates] + 300 \$3 50

³⁰ Sir Ernest Gowers, *Plain Words* British Information Services New York, 1948 Pp vi + 94 \$1 15

few exceptions my examples of the use of English, good and bad, are taken from documents written by officials during the last few years By "officials" I mean not only those commonly called "civil servants," but also members of the Navy, Army and Air Force, Local Government officials, and the staffs of public bodies such as the Railways

But title and subtitle tell the story, in little, between them The author is trying to guide officialdom away from "officialese" to the use of plain English, or, as he himself prefers to put it, "to convert *officialese* into a term of praise by cultivating unremittingly that clarity of thought and simplicity of expression which have always been preached by those who have studied the art of writing" (p 94) His book falls into eleven chapters prologue, digression on legal English, the elements, correctness, the choice of words (1) introductory, (2) avoiding the superfluous, (3) choosing the familiar, and (4) choosing the concrete, the handling of words, punctuation, and epilogue The book has many virtues. By taking its precepts and practice to heart, an official may indeed improve his English style beyond recognition The following comments are offered for what they are worth

P 25 the Society for Pure English has now disbanded P 27 the verb *loan* is no monstrosity, it goes back to ME times (see *NED*), and would be perfectly legitimate even were it a modern coinage P 28 Saintsbury's description of English as "a language which is almost wholly exception and idiom" is sheer nonsense, of course (though the author seems to take it seriously), and Jespersen is far from echoing it in the passage quoted (or anywhere else) P 29 the author's prescriptions here are good examples of the pedantry which he elsewhere (e g, on p 50) deplors In particular, he himself later (p 75) contradicts his own dictum that *none* "cannot possibly take a plural verb" Note Jespersen's contrary formulation "*None* is now regularly followed by a verb in the plural" (*Mod Eng Gram* II 421 bottom) P 40 the author rightly objects to "from every angle," but his suggestion for improvement, "in every respect," though well enough, lacks the simplicity of "in every way," a turn of phrase which seems not to have occurred to him P 43 footnote for *Jespersen's* read Jespersen's P 63 occasionally the author himself falls into "officialese" or the like, as when he says "the writer cannot be acquitted of shirking" instead of simply "the writer shirked" P 88 the author quotes as an example of badly expressed sentence the following "Their portable boat was soon found by a military patrol hidden under a bush on the shore" This is certainly a faulty sentence, but the author's suggestion to "put a comma after *patrol* so as to throw *hidden* back to *boat*" is not a good one The proper remedy, of course, is to change from passive to active construction

In 1939 the first volume of Professor W F Leopold's *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child* came out (see *MLN* LVII 144 f), it dealt with the vocabulary of the subject. Now we have Vol II, "Sound-Learning in the First Two Years" ³¹ Completed in 1943, the volume, because of war conditions, lay unpublished for four years. It falls into seven main parts: Representation of Standard Sounds in the Child's Speech (pp 1-85), Tabulation of the Child's Representation of Standard Sounds (pp 86-94), Tabulation of the Child's Sounds and their Standard Prototypes (pp 95-107), Analysis of the Child's Substitutions (pp 108-137), Analysis of the Child's Sound System (pp 138-206), General Phonetic Problems (pp 207-256), and The Process of Learning Sounds (pp. 257-274). There follow a critical bibliography (pp 275-283) and an index (pp 285-295). The author is a sound linguist, in the study of children's speech he is preeminent. His first volume was of the highest quality, and his second measures up to the standard set in the first. Nowhere in the "literature" of the subject will be found so thorough and so accurate a book as this. One may mention in particular his discussions of reduplication (including semi-reduplication), whisper, homonyms, and, above all, sound-substitution patterns. In part, his book serves as a corrective and control of the phonemic analysis attempted by R Jakobson in his *Kindersprache*. In the following I venture to criticize certain features of the presentation, but my criticisms are not to be taken as seriously modifying my favorable opinion of the volume as a whole:

P 31 the opposition set up here and elsewhere between stop and continuant is false and should be discarded. As every phonetician knows, a stop may be and often is a continuant, and long stops play an important part in the sound-system of many languages (e g Italian and Icelandic). The proper opposition, of course, is that between stop and patent. See under *patent* (def 14) in the *ACD*, and see my paper of 1936 in *English Studies* (xviii 159-164). Pp 32, 70, 84, etc. I see no reason to replace the perfectly good and generally understood *trill* by the neologism *vibrant*, this innovation is particularly objectionable in that *vibrant* has another technical meaning (see *ACD*). Pp 34, 74, 199 the author is unhappy about "making a distinction between palatals and velars" (p 74) when it comes to the stops, since no such distinction is phonemic in English. Here a new term is really needed, but the author's *palatal-velar* (p 199)

³¹ Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities XI, Evanston, 1947
Pp xii + 296 \$5 50

seems clumsy Let me call his attention to the term *tectal*, which I used over a quarter of a century ago in my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic*, before phonemics had begun to flourish, but which is, I think, wholly suitable for phonemic use P 38 I see no reason to call [w] a glide, it can be geminated (it was, in proto-Germanic) and I find it easy to hold the sound indefinitely without shifting the position of the articulatory organs P 79 it is wrong to speak of the "disappearance" of medial fricative *g* in English, OE *segl* became ME *seil* by a process of lowering, the phoneme, by virtue of this lowering, lost its fricative character and became a semi-vowel P 82 English [j] is no more a glide than is English [w] P 111 footnote the author stigmatizes his term "on glide" as inaccurate but uses it nevertheless Why not say *onset*? P 112 it is wrong to say that "dental fricatives must be articulated against the teeth" Danish [ð] was long ago analyzed as made against the gums or even further back, and toothless Icelanders have no trouble making a perfectly good [ð], though their phoneme is not identical with English [ð], one must admit See my discussion in my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic*, pp 16, 109, as also in *MLN* XLIII 511 P 138 the author's account of the child's sound system "by itself" is also diachronic, and the comparison with synchronic analysis is inexact, as indeed the author seems to feel if not fully to realize P 204 for disquisition *read* distinction.

Mrs Zimmerman's valuable monograph²² has the following subtitle "A Study of Two Hundred Educated Non-Professional Radio Speakers" By quotations from well-known dictionaries and from authorities on English the author makes it clear that, in theory, the pronunciations given in standard works of reference conform to the usage of educated speakers of English Do these works actually reproduce educated usage? The author decided to find out. As she says (pp 4-5),

for a number of years it has been possible for observers to supplement their direct observations of speech by phonograph recordings of English as it is spoken by educated people [giving] a body of phonographically recorded material which can be played over and over again by a listener until he has thoroughly familiarized himself with it, and which can also be checked by other auditors Conditions for study and research in the field of speech have been improved materially by the development of the radio, and by the appearance on the market of phonographic recording instruments equipped with attachments for making recordings from radio broadcasts There are hundreds of prominent and well educated speakers scheduled for talks or addresses on radio programs weekly, whose speech can be recorded at little cost

²² Jane Dorsey Zimmerman, *Radio Pronunciations* King's Crown Press New York, 1946 Pp viii + 136 \$2.00

The author took advantage of these facilities and made "several hundred records of broadcasts originating in this country and abroad" (p 7). The speakers whose broadcasts were chosen for recording "were all educated native-born citizens of the continental United States. . . Most of the speakers were national figures, who held positions of influence and importance in public affairs" (p 7). Among the speakers were Mr and Mrs Franklin D. Roosevelt, President M. Carey Thomas of Bryn Mawr College, Herbert Hoover, Professor G L Kittredge, H L Mencken, and many others of like prominence. All parts of the country were represented in the list of speakers, and great care was taken to make the geographical distribution equitable. In a sense, however, the speakers were representative of one class only: the country's leading citizens, the pacemakers in American civilization. Indeed, since nearly all of them "held one or more college degrees" (p 7), the speakers represented only those of the nation's leaders who had had the benefit of a good education. By study of their broadcasts it ought to be possible to find out the main features of cultivated American pronunciation.

Mrs Zimmerman has made this study and her results are solidly based on the actual usage of educated Americans. These results she has compared with the pronunciations recorded in the Merriam-Webster *New International* of 1934. Presumably the Kenyon-Knott *Pronouncing Dictionary* (published in 1944) came out too late to be used for this purpose. She finds that "the amount of agreement in pronunciation between the speakers in this study and Webster's *Dictionary*" is "about 70 per cent" (p 110) and she considers this to indicate "that this dictionary is abreast of current practice to a high degree" (p 111). But she hastens to modify this extraordinary conclusion by adding that "the 30 per cent lack of agreement is too great for such an important reference work as this" (ib). A little later on she tells us what she thinks of the Webster system of marking the pronunciation.

The 'simple' phonetic symbols of Webster's *New International* are anything but simple for the untrained dictionary user. Children who are told to 'compare your pronunciation with the one you find in the dictionary' will find it practically impossible to determine what 'the one' in the dictionary is, to say nothing of comparing it with their own. Even experienced *Dictionary* readers find the system confusing and time consuming. The IPA alphabet is the best graphic system devised to date for recording the pronunciation, not only of English, but of many other languages (p 112).

But far more important than any comparison with Webster are the results themselves, the evidence gleaned, presented, and analyzed by the author in her study of the records she made of actual speech. Here it is impossible to do more than give samples taken from the rich store of facts to be found in Mrs Zimmerman's monograph. I choose for presentation a few cases which call for comment or correction.

Pp 28, 29, 40 here, under the head "consistency of speakers with themselves," one finds cases which are not properly classified under such a head. A speaker whose *used* is [juzd] but whose *used to* is [justə] is not guilty of inconsistency, since the variants occur in different phonetic environments. The same applies to the variants of *best*, here, moreover, one may even doubt that the author heard rightly the variant said to be without [t], as this phoneme, before a consonant or "final in the sense group," may have been pronounced without explosive release, in which case one might not hear it at all on a phonograph record. So also with the [k] of *task* (p 43). The two variants of *hundred*, in the mouth of the speaker whose words are quoted, are not inconsistent, since there is a marked difference in stress in the two occurrences. The loss of *r* in *Mister Lincoln* but not in *Mister Douglas* may mean, not that the speaker is inconsistent, but that his *r* is regularly lost before a liquid. The variation between [æ] and [ə] in *address* is not inconsistent if [æ] is used for the noun but [ə] for the verb. There is no inconsistency involved in using a trisyllabic pronunciation of *interest* but a disyllabic pronunciation of the element *interest-* in the derivative *interested*. Etc, etc. P 38 in my own pronunciation *taken* has syllabic [ŋ], not syllabic [n], and I wonder if that was not the case with some of Mrs Zimmerman's speakers as well. P 42 the author tells us that "[t] final, or in pre-consonantal position, was omitted in 290, or approximately 12 per cent of the occurrences of thirty-five words which were pronounced 1,605 times." I am skeptical about many of these supposed omissions, see above. Pp 69-70, the author says, "One hundred and thirty-five of the 206 occurrences of the words *idea*, *ideal*, *real*, and *realize* were recorded with [ɪ]." This is well enough but needs to be broken down. In my own pronunciation *idea*, *real*, and *realize* have [ɪ] but *ideal* has [i] and I find that Mrs Zimmerman records only one occurrence of [ɪ] in *idea* (as against 40 occurrences of [i]), whereas the figures for *ideal* are 19 and 17 respectively. I find myself in a more than two to one majority when it comes to *real* (63 to 30), but in my pronunciation of *realize* I belong to a minority group (15 to 21).

Mrs Zimmerman's book deserves a prominent place on the working-desk of every lexicographer. It is one of the most important contributions to our knowledge of cultivated American pronunciation that have ever been made.

During the period covered by the present survey three dictionaries of the English language have come out³³ They will not be reviewed here, as the present writer had a share in preparing all three For a comparative study of two of them (and of other dictionaries of like scope), see James B McMillan, "Five College Dictionaries," in *College English* X 214-221 (Jan., 1949) Another fascicle of *The Scottish National Dictionary*³⁴ has also appeared This ten-volume work, begun in 1928, is proceeding but slowly The first volume was completed in 1934, the second in 1941, and Part I of the third was issued in 1944 The founder and chief editor, William Grant, died, in 1946, he has been succeeded by David Murison The present fascicle was compiled by Miss Dorothy B Gordon, who left the dictionary staff in 1943, evidently Part II was ready for publication then, but war conditions and the shortage of paper delayed its publication for five years It completes the letter C (p 217-298) and gives us the first 30 pages of the letter D The fascicle maintains the standards set in previous instalments of the dictionary The following comments on the etymologies may be worthy of record

Under *crang* 'neck' we are told that "the final plosive suggests that the word may have come in *via* Scandinavia," but Icel *kragi* 'collar' and the like have fricative, not stop *g* The adj *crank* 'weak' is connected with the first instead of the second noun *crank*, presumably by misprint The base of *crookamtion*, *crookmition* is surely *crookan-*, *crookm*, not *crook-* If *crookm* is the older variant, one may connect it with *crooking stone* Under *cromack* one finds the statement that *krumma* 'paw' also means 'handful' in Modern Icelandic, but this meaning is not recorded in Zoega, Sigfusson, or Blondal Etymologically speaking, *cuffock* 'coil' means 'cufflike object,' not 'little cuff' *Custer* or *cuther* is best connected with *cuddle*, the two words having the same base but different suffixes Compare *cuttite*, which seems to be a variant of *cuddle* Under *daft* it is odd to find OE *gedæfte* spelt *gedæfte*

We end this survey with a look at a quantitative stylistic study³⁵

³³ C E Funk (ed.), *New Practical Standard Dictionary of the English Language*, Funk & Wagnalls Co New York, 1946, pp xviii + 1560, C E Funk (ed.), *New College Standard Dictionary of the English Language*, Funk & Wagnalls Co New York, 1947, pp xvi + 1404, C L Barnhart (ed.), *The American College Dictionary*, Random House, Inc New York, 1947, pp xi + 1432.

³⁴ Vol III, Part II, Covener-Dayligaun Aberdeen, 1948

³⁵ Josephine Miles, *Major Adjectives in English Poetry from Wyatt to*

The author has counted adjectives from Chaucer (not Wyatt) to Housman (not Auden) in Tables 1 and 2. In Tables 3 and 4 she begins with Wyatt and ends with Dylan Thomas. She tells us that her count "establishes the ten descriptive adjectives most used by each poet" (p. 309). But in Table 1, though ten adjectives are given for some of the poets named, a smaller number is credited to others, thus, Milton has only seven, Cowper only six. On the other hand, Burns and Keats have eleven each. The author explains (p. 311) that "some lists shorten or lengthen to suit the break in quantity." In defining *adjective* the author cites two authorities (p. 309): "Webster's Dictionary" and "Frederick Bodmer in *The Loom of Language*." Her second authority is obviously ill-chosen, and in a learned work the dictionary cited ought to be the *NED*. The author excludes demonstrative and pronominal adjectives from her investigation, but includes quantifiers as well as qualifiers, as also participles "when used adjectivally" (p. 309). However, "the lists of major adjectives do not include the participial and limiting forms analyzed in the texts, but, for simplicity's sake, merely the descriptive forms which on the whole are individually most frequent" (p. 311). In making her count, the author wisely used three procedures, and describes her results as "the combined observations of concordance quantities, of thousand-line proportions, and of single-poem proportions" (p. 312). Her study falls into five sections. In the first, "Glass to Pattern," she explains her method and gives her quantitative results in four tables. In the second, "Four Poets of Discourse: Wyatt, Donne, Pope, Wordsworth," and in the third, "Four Poets of Description: Spenser, Milton, Collins, Keats," she studies some "historical" poets, in the fourth, "Modern Quality," some "modern" poets. She presents her conclusions in a final section, "Good to Bright." I quote one sentence from this section (p. 420):

We see through these varieties the steadfast abundance of the mere forty major terms in all their force of agreement in use by two dozen major poets, the good and great and new and old, the bad and last and little and poor and dead, the fading dear and fair, happy and sad and true and sweet, the increasing white, gold, green, blue, red, dry, young, and the components of bright, the shine of the participle in *-ing*.

KEMP MALONE

REVIEWS

Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe VIII Briefwechsel 1. Hälfte 1750-1790 *IX* Briefwechsel 2. Hälfte 1791-1812 verzeichnet von BERNHARD SEUFFERT in Graz [*IX* Unter Mitwirkung von Dr. Margarete Seuffert] Aus den Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Jahrgang 1936 Phil.-hist. Klasse Nr. 41 [Jahrgang 1940 Phil.-hist. Klasse Nr. 15] Berlin 1937, 1941 Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Komm. bei Walter de Gruyter u. Co. 167, 215 pp. 4° Einzelausgabe

At the beginning of our century the Berlin Academy decided to publish a complete critical edition of Wieland, containing the works proper, the translations, and the correspondence. Bernhard Seuffert, who had already collected material for a biography of the poet, was commissioned to prepare the *Prolegomena* on which the new edition was to be based. In the seven fascicles of *Prolegomena* published between 1904 and 1921 in the Transactions of the Academy, all of Wieland's writings from 1743 to 1812 are listed and arranged in their proper places (There are more than 1250 items). The editors of the individual volumes found their tasks all mapped out for them. The two World Wars naturally delayed the publication of the edition: ten volumes appeared from 1909 to 1913, then came an interval of 15 years, from 1928 to 1939 twelve volumes were published, leaving approximately six more to come. When these will appear cannot be predicted under the present troublous conditions.

The new fascicles VIII and IX of the *Prolegomena* deal with the correspondence. As a preliminary there is a general survey of the various extant collections of Wieland's letters, both printed and manuscript, and reference is made to lost letters of which we have knowledge. The chief printed collections, namely those of Gessner, Ludwig Wieland, Hassencamp, Horn, Keil, and Wagner, are described. Speaking of lost letters, it may be remarked that letters of Wieland, both published and unpublished, up to 1939, and perhaps later, were frequently offered in antiquarian catalogs. More than sixty letters are preserved in American collections, both private and public. For many years Seuffert made it his business to ferret out previously unnoticed Wieland letters. His list has over 5600 entries, in which, to be sure, are included some letters—say 500—addressed by others to Wieland. The intention is not

to publish all the letters to Wieland, they are included here because they give the setting for Wieland's own letters

Every entry states where that particular letter has been published, if at all, it records the present owner of the manuscript, and tells also in what antiquarian catalog, if any, the letter had previously been offered for sale. In the case of undatable or fragmentary letters, or those whose addressees could not definitely be established, the opening words are quoted

Wherever possible, Seuffert procured copies of new letters, made by himself, if he had the letter before him, otherwise he enlisted the aid of friends, librarians, and other well-wishers of the Wieland Edition. This collection of transcripts is now invaluable, as many letters were presumably lost during the war. For many years Seuffert had hoped that it might be his privilege to edit at least the first volume of the Correspondence, but this hope was not realized, as he died in 1938, at the ripe age of eighty-five years, most of which had been devoted to the study of Wieland. Seuffert's son, Professor Burkhard Seuffert, presented his father's library, including the Wieland material, to the German Seminary of the University of Graz, where the collection is housed in a special room. Seuffert's daughter-in-law, Dr. Margarete Seuffert, saw fascicle IX through the press, and also prepared the two indices *Register der Korrespondenten*, and *Register der in dieses Verzeichnis aufgenommenen Briefanfänge*. These two indices make the *Prolegomena* a most valuable tool.

W. KURRELMEYER

Matthew Arnold A Study in Conflict By EDWARD K. BROWN
Chicago The University of Chicago Press, 1948. Pp lx, 224.
\$3 00

This book traverses Arnold's career from a fresh, though limited, point of view. Mr. Brown takes the poet-critic at his word, that disinterestedness is the one thing needful in life and letters, and measures his performance by this lofty standard.

After surveying Arnold's inconsistencies in style and taste, the author goes on to show how the dominant mood of his poetry is the desire to see life steadily and whole. Arnold was torn, however, by the conflict between his impulses towards objectivity and those towards action. No sooner had he spoken his mind on contemporary affairs than he returned to his original position. In his fourth chapter, to my mind the most stimulating in the book, Mr. Brown draws an interesting analogy between the human ideals presented in Arnold's poetry and those same ideals as they reappear in some of the *Essays in Criticism* (1865) aloofness from

turmoil in the Scholar Gipsy and Maurice de Guérin, love of light in Balder and Joubert. In these projections of himself Arnold reached, paradoxically, the climax of his career as a disinterested writer, though he was to re-capture the same mood of detachment later, as, for example, in "The Study of Poetry" and "Wordsworth."

Students will be grateful for this new estimate of Arnold's work, for the keen analysis of his style and form, based as it is upon an intimate knowledge of the text. Nobody, in all probability, has read Arnold with closer attention to detail than the author of this book, as those can testify who know his *Studies in the Text of Matthew Arnold's Prose Works*.

"Tell Mat not to write any more of those things like *Literature and Dogma*," Tennyson once said, "but to give us something like his 'Thyrsis,' 'Scholar Gipsy,' or 'The Forsaken Merman.'" Mr. Brown shows how correct Tennyson's judgment was. At times, however, his application of the touchstone of disinterestedness may seem severe. He has a good word for the design and persuasiveness of *St. Paul and Protestantism* but dismisses *Culture and Anarchy*, which Trilling, for example, declares the keystone of Arnold's intellectual life, as mere pamphleteering.

This is, in sum, a study of Arnold as artist, using that word in Pater's sense, the man who is at one with himself and who, thanks to this spiritual unity, makes a "dextrous outline" of his personality in his writing. In a terminal note, Mr. Brown generalizes upon his thesis: "The impulse to address his own age and to operate on it is wholly legitimate in the artist. But the artist relates himself most successfully to his age when he remains within the terms of his art." Browning in *Men and Women* managed to speak to his age through his art, but Arnold, a much less well integrated personality, could not resist making frontal attacks on the problems of religion and society. From this impetuosity arose his faults of temper and his "artistic disasters." This view of Arnold leaves out of account the motivation, both personal and historical, behind his "practical" criticism—for example, Arnold's desire to complete the work begun by his father in religious liberalism, or his response to the challenge of the fierce turmoils of the sixties. But the motivation, no matter how human or understandable, does not justify the end, if the end is not a disinterested one. Such is the upshot of this book. In some moods Arnold himself surely would have agreed with it.

WILLIAM BLACKBURN

Duke University

Erratum P. 472, 5th quotation, 3rd line, read

Mais devant l'Eternel, ils ne sont que poussière

INDEX

SUBJECTS

- Adam of Bremen**
Adami Bremenis Gesta Hamma-
burgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum 214
- Adams, J Q** Memorial Studies 359
- Aimeric de Peguilhan**
Us jois novels, complitz de grans
beutatz 333
- Alphabet, The** a Key to the History
of Mankind 182
- Amadis**
Further Note on the Thirty Points
of Woman's Beauty 272
- American Literature**
American Dreams A Study of
American Utopias 204, Articles
on — Appearing in Current Peri-
odicals, 1920 45 67
- Arnold, Matthew**
—, A Study 211, — A Study in
Conflict 575
- Ashton, Thomas**, see Walpole, Horace
- Aucassin et Nicolette**
L'Emploi du mot *desport* dans —
164
- Bailey**
"Wild Bells" in —'s *Festus*? 256
- Beaumont**, see Fletcher
- Beowulf**
— 249 *white* = Icelandic *litr* 347,
A Note on *The Rhythm* of — 310
- Bible**
Les Lamentations de Jérémie et la
poésie française du XVI^e siècle
181, Milton's Aid to the *Poly-*
glott — 345
- Blake**
Fearful Symmetry, A Study of
William — 62
- Bohtlingk**
Geoffroy Saint Hilaire a Transla-
tor of Goethe? 47
- British Review, The**
Lord Byron and "My Grand-
mother's Review" 25
- Browne, Arthur**
Another Eighteenth-Century Dis-
tinction between Fancy and Imagi-
nation 23
- Buchner, Georg**, *Gesammelte Werke*
501.
- Byron, Lord**, and "My Grand-
mother's Review" 25
- Campbell, Thomas**
Dr —'s Diary of a Visit to
England in 1775 142
- cask* 44
- casket* 44
- Castiglione, see Gellius
- Catullus a la Wilder 288
- Caxton's Original Additions to the
Legenda Aurea 259
- Chanson de Roland*
French Precursors of the — 354,
Once More, *Durendal* 161
- Chapman**
The Body as a Triangular Struc-
ture in Spenser and — 520
- Chateaubriand**
A Note on the Natural Bridge in
Atala 406
- Chaucer**
The Canterbury Tales A new
modern English prose translation
with the original ME text
of the General Prologue and the
Nun's Priest's Tale 500, — and
the Fifteenth Century 190, —'s
"Airish Beasts" 339, —'s *kanke-*
dort [*Troilus and Criseyde* II,
1752] 264, —'s Philippa, Daughter
of Panneto 342, —'s World 189,
Chaucer and Partlet Identi-
fied 78, The Classical Lamenta-
tions in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*
76, Further Seventeenth Century
— Allusions 81, John Heywood,
—, and Lydgate 55, Kanke(r)dort
'A State of Suspense, a Difficult
position' 502, *The Man of Law's*
Tale 12, Medieval Chess and the
Book of the Duchess 261, *Troilus*
and Criseyde 213, Two Irregular
—ian Stanzas 306, Two Notes on
J T Williams' "Words into
Images in —'s *Hous of Fame*" 73
- Chroniques gargantues*
La Fée Morgain et les — 52
- Cleveland**, see Cowley
- Comparative Literature* 360

- Corneille
Tragédie cornélienne, tragedie racienne 282
- Cotgrave, Randle
The Sources of *A Dictionary of the French and English Tongues*, by — 431.
- Cowley
The University Miscellanies Some Neglected Early Texts of Cleveland and — 423
- Dante
—'s American Pilgrimage A Historical Survey of — Studies in the U S 1800 1944 198, Rising to Christ on the Cross (*Paradiso*, XI, 70-72) 166, Saul's Pride (*Purg* XII 40-42) 267
- Daude de Pradas
Us jous novels, complitz de grans beutatz 333
- Davies, John, see La Rochefoucauld
- Dekker, Thomas, Robert Wilson, and
The Shoemakers Holiday 517
- desport 164
- Dickens
The Cheeryble Brothers a Further Note 269
- Diderot and Patriotism, A Note on 476
- dignitas* 144
- Donne, John
— and the Tower of Babel 481
- Dostoyevski
Ideological Antecedents of the *Brothers Karamasov* 400
- Dryden
A Note on the Date of a — Letter 528, A Quaint Conceit from Guarini to — 461
- Du Vau, see Wieland
- Eliot, George Her Life and Books 347
- Eliot, T S
Between Fixity and Flux, A Study of the Concept of Poetry in the Criticism of — 199, The Ghost of Swift in *Four Quartets* 273.
- Emblem Books
Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery, II A Bibliography of — 203
- English
Anglo Saxon 312, *casket*; *cask* 44, Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue anglaise 193, To Get/Be Invited 433, Initiation pratique à l'anglais 215, Innocuous Linguistic Indecorum a Semantic Byway 1, Some Linguistic Studies of 1945 1948 532
- English Drama
Crabbed Age and Youth The Old Men and Women in the Restoration Comedy of Manners 69, Die Englische Farce im 19 Jahrhundert 139, The Frontiers of Drama 127
- English Literature
Another Eighteenth-Century Distinction between Fancy and Imagination 23, Essays in Retrospect 353, Fair Rosamond A Study of the Development of a Literary Theme 143, The Oxford History of — 190, Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England 192
- English Poetry
Les Chansons Élizabéthaines 287, Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth Century Critics 125, Middle English Poems by Mydwynter 454, Das Problem der Fragmentarischen Dichtung in der Englischen Romantik 140
- Erratum 576
- Etherege
A Note on *The Man of Mode* 343
- Etherege, Dame May 419
- Flaubert
A Misdated — Letter 425, Tourgueneff's New Year's Greeting to — 115
- Fletcher
—, Beaumont & Co Entertainers to the Jacobean Gentry 206, The Sources of *The Double Marriage* in — and Massinger 505
- Fontane
Ein Berliner 'Sperl' bei — 391
- French Drama
Trois Querelles au XVII^e siècle 446
- French Poetry
Les Lamentations de Jérémie et la poésie française du XVI^e siècle 181
- Freneau, see Monroe
- Galdós, Pérez, Spanish Liberal Crusader 286
- Gawain, *Sur, and the Green Knight*
The Chronology of — 85.

- Gellius, Aulus
 Warlike Flutes —, Castiglione, Montaigne, and Milton 96
- Geoffrey of Monmouth
 — and the Late Latin Chroniclers, 1300-1500 215, — and Milton's *Comus* 315
- Geiman
Klar wie Klossbruch 493, —, see '*Turkenkalender*'
- German Drama
 Die geistlichen Prozessionsspiele in Deutschland 273
- German Literature
 The "Brown Night" in the German Baroque 380, *Damonie und Verklarung* 430, Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert, Ausdruck und Grosse 430, No Voice is Wholly Lost 497, An Unnoticed Middle Bavarian Prose Version of Pseudo Aristotelian Proverbs 491
- Germany's Stepchildren 494
- get 433
- Gide
 A Preliminary Note on Goethe and André — 326
- Godeau, Antoine, Georges de Scudéry and 471, 576
- Goethe
 Essays um — 187, Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire a Translator of —' 47, — und seine Zeit 275, A preliminary Note on — and André Gide 326
- Gray, Thomas, see Walpole, Horace
- Gullparzer's Self Identification with Rousseau 398
- Guarini
 A Quaint Concert from — to Dryden 461
- guripa 39
- Habington, William, The Poems of 351
- Hamilton, see Monroe
- Hardy
 On a Darkling Plain 66, The Poetry of Thomas — 65
- Harris, G W
 Sut Lovingood and Mark Twain's *Joan of Arc* 37
- Heine, Mathilde
 —'s Album 387
- Heinrich Julius Duke of Brunswick 185
- Heywood, John, Chaucer, and Lydgate 55
- Hill, John
 Dr Johnson on Dr Hill 15
- Hopkins, G M
 A Note on *The Windhover* 271, The Prosodic Theory of — 200
- Howells, William Dean, A Bibliography of 212
- Irish Literature
 The Cycles of the Kings 214
- Italian Literature
 Der italienische Humanismus 352, The Renaissance Philosophy of Man 210, Reply to Professor Orsini 504
- James, Alice, see James, Henry
- James, Henry
 The James Family, Including Selections from the Writings of Henry James, Senior, William, —, & Alice James 116, The Notebooks of — 116
- James, Henry, Senior, see James, Henry
- James, William, see James, Henry
- Jefferson, see Monroe
- Johnson, Dr, on Dr Hill 15, see Richelet
- Jonson, Ben
 Apologie for "Bartholmew Fayre," The Art of —'s Comedies 135, The Satiric and Didactic in —'s Comedy 213
- Joyce's, James, Epiphanies 346
- kankedort 264
- kanke(r)dort 502
- Keats
 — and the Daemon King 63, —'s "O for a Life of Sensations" 229, Swinburne on — 168.
- Kleist, Heinrich von
 The Dramas of — 428
- Klossbruch' 493
- Kyd
 An Echo from *The Spanish Tragedy* 297
- Laborde's *View of Spain*, Wordsworth's Debt to 29
- La Mettrie, Elie Luzac's Refutation of 159
- Langland
 Manly's Marginal Notes on the 'Piers Plowman' Controversy 9
- La Rochefoucauld
 The Earliest English Translation of —'s *Maximes* 413

- Law, William
A Note on —'s *The Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage Entertainment* 180
- Lawman
Geinemude and the Benighted "Geography of the Minstrels" 70
- Lawrence, D H
Eros and Psyche a Nietzschean Motif in Anglo-American Literature 217, The "Simile of the Sparrow" in *The Rainbow* by — 171
- Lee's *The Rival Queens* (1677), Milton and 527
- Legenda Aurea*, Caxton's Original Additions to the 259
- Lemaire de Belges, Jean
La Concorde des deux langages 280, *Les épîtres de l'amant vert* 280, — et la complainte de Marguerite d'Autriche sur la mort de son pere 338
- Lessing's *Faust Fragment* and *Romeo and Juliet* 395
- Let abroad* 288
- Linguistics and Literary History 56
- Literary History, Linguistics and 56
- litr* 347
- Lormes, de, see Richelet
- Ludus Coventinae*
'Out born' in — 88
- Luzac's, Elie, Refutation of La Mettrie 159
- Lydgate
John Heywood, Chaucer, and — 55, A Source for the Passage on the Origin of Chess in —'s *Troy Book* 87
- Manley, J M
—'s Marginal Notes on the 'Piers Plowman' Controversy 9
- Manuscripts
The Census of Medieval and Renaissance — in the U S and Canada 216
- Marguerite d'Autriche
Jean Lemaire et la complainte de — sur la mort de son pere 338
- Marie de France, *Lais*, Prologue, 13 16 336
- Mark Twain
The Sources of *The Prince and the Pauper* 103, Sut Lovingood and —'s *Joan of Arc* 37
- Massinger
The Sources of *The Double Marriage* in Fletcher and — 505.
- Maupassant
—'s Paris Addresses 323, New Light on the — Family 150
- Melville's Third Whaler 241, —'s Use of Two Pseudo Sciences 145
- Mendes Pinto, Feirão Un précurseur de l'exotisme au XVI^e siècle 194
- Milton
Daniel Skinner, Lord Preston, and —'s Commonplace Book 522, Geoffrey of Monmouth and —'s *Comus* 315, John — at St Paul's School a Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education 130, — and Lee's *The Rival Queens* (1677) 527, —'s "Aerie Microscope" 525, —'s Aid to the *Polyglott Bible* 345, A Note on *Comus* 179, On the Composition of *Paradise Lost*, A Study of the Ordering and Insertion of Material 129, "Paradise Lost" and its Critics 208, see Gellhus
- Moliere
A contemporary Judgment on — 49, A Note on *The Man of Mode* 343, Racine and "Le Cocuage de —" 51
- Monroe's Defense of Jefferson and Fieneau against Hamilton 215
- Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley, *The Nonsense of Common sense* 1737-1738 132
- Montaigne, see Gellhus
- Nietzsche
Eros and Psyche A —an Motif in Anglo-American Literature 217
- Novalis, *Hymns to the Night* 209
- nozol* 468
- O'Connor, see Whitman, Walt
- Old English
Functional Change in Early English 498
- Old Norse
Etymologies of — Proper Names Used as Poetic Designations 486
- O'Neill
Eros and Psyche A Nietzschean Motif in Anglo-American Literature 217
- Orsini, Reply to Professor 504
- Otfriid, *Ad Luitbertum, Dignitas* in 144.
- out born* 88

- Pantisocracy**, see Priestley
- Pearl**
The —'s Author as Herbalist 83
- Poe**
A Note on — in 1838 174, —'s 'To Helen' 289
- Pontus de Tyard and the *Quærelle des femmes* 331**
- Pope, J. C., *The Rhythm of Beowulf* 310**
- Portuguese Poetry**
Notes on Hispanic Poetry 110
- Preston, Lord**
Daniel Skinner, —, and Milton's *Commonplace Book* 522
- Priestley, Joseph, and the Problem of Pantisocracy 204**
- Proust**
Marcel —'s *Maxims* Again 410
- Provençal**
Old — "nozol" 468
- Provençal Literature**
The Troubadours and the Assassins 245
- Proverbs, Pseudo Aristotelian 491**
- Quevedo**
A Plagiarism from —'s *Sueños* 329
- Rabelais and the Greek Dances 251**
- Racine**
— and "Le cocuage de Molière" 51, *Tragedie cornélienne, tragédie racinienne* 282
- Rankins, W., Seven Satires (1598) 359**
- Richelet, Fore-runner of Samuel Johnson, and de Lormes 474**
- Rousseau, see Grillparzer**
- Russian**
New Complete English — Dictionary 360
- Russian Literature**
History of Early — 358
- Saint-Hilaire, Geoffroy, a Translator of Goethe? 47**
- Santos, Francisco**
A Plagiarism from Quevedo's *Sueños* 329
- Scudéry, Georges de, and Antoine Godeau 471, 576**
- Shakespeare**
The Bad Weather in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* 319, The Crown of Life Essays in Interpretation of —'s Final Plays 137, The Earthquake in *Romeo and Juliet* 417, *Essai sur les Idées dans l'œuvre de* — 122, Essays of — an arrangement 144, Lessing's *Faust Fragment* and *Romeo and Juliet* 395; *Macbeth* 69, A Note on *The Taming of the Shrew* 94, Ophelia's "Nothing" 322, Othello and Peregriana, "Richer than All His Tribe" 415, The Pedant and Church in *Twelfth Night*, III ii 80 513, Pompey as the Mythical Lover of Cleopatra 515, Le Preromantisme, études d'histoire européenne La Découverte de Shakespeare sur le continent 201, —'s Use of the Arts of Language 120, —'s Word Play on *tombe* 235, — und der Tragodienstil seiner Zeit 124, The Third Type of Aside in — 510, This Great Stage Image and Structure in *King Lear* 357
- Shelley**
An Armenian Performance of —'s *The Cenci* 178, —'s Major Poetry The Fabric of a Vision 278
- Shoemakers Holiday*, Thomas Dekker, Robert Wilson and *The* 517**
- Skinner, Daniel, Lord Preston, and Milton's *Commonplace Book* 522**
- Smollett and the Death of King William III 21.**
- Spanish**
gurrupá 39
- Spanish Poetry**
Notes on Hispanic Poetry 110
- Spenser**
Alliteration as a Means of Stanza Connection in *The Faerie Queene* 90, The Body as a Triangular Structure in — and Chapman 520, A Note on —'s Use of Trope 53, On the Closing Lines of *The Faerie Queene* 93; The Works of Edmund — A Variorum Edition The Minor Poems, II 60
- Steele and the Drury Lane Patent 19**
- Sterne**
Laurence —'s Sermons of Mr Yorick 141, The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence — 356
- Stifter, Adalbert**
Die Mutter in —s Werken 483.
- Stylistics**
Linguistics and Literary History Essays in — 56
- Swift**
The Ghost of — in *Four Quartets* 273

- de Jérémie et la poésie française du XVI^e siècle 181
- Frank, John G (not C), A Note on the Natural Bridge in *Atala* 406
- Frappier, J (ed), Jean Lemaire de Belges, *La concorde des deux langages, Les épîtres de l'amant vert* 280
- French, W H, Medieval Chess and the *Book of the Duchess* 261
- Frye, N, Fearful Symmetry, A Study of William Blake 62
- Fucilla, J G, Notes on Hispanic Poetry 110
- Fussell, P, Jr, A Note on *The Windhover* 271
- Garin, E, Der italienische Humanismus 352, Reply to Professor Orsini 504
- Gibson, W M, and G Arm, A Bibliography of William Dean Howells 212
- Gilbert, A H, On the Composition of *Paradise Lost* 129
- Gohn, E S, A Note on Spenser's Use of Trope 53
- Gudzy, N K, History of Early Russian Literature, tr by S W Jones, introd by Gleb Struve 358
- Gugler, I, Das Problem der Fragmentarischen Dichtung in der Englischen Romantik 140
- Halsband, R (ed), *The Nonsense of Common Sense 1737-1738 by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* 132
- Hammond, J H, A Plagiarism from Quevedo's *Sueñas* 329
- Hammond, L V D H, Laurence Sterne's Sermons of Mr Yorick 141
- Hatcher, A G, To Get/Be Invited 433
- Heflin, W L, Melville's Third Whaler 241
- Heilman, R B, This Great Stage Image and Structure in *King Lear* 357
- Heltzel, V B, Fair Rosamond 143
- Hendrickson, J R, An Ambassador 288, Catullus à la Wilder 288.
- Herbert, T W, Shakespeare's Word-Play on *tombe* 235
- Hillway, T, Melville's Use of Two Pseudo-Sciences 145
- Holloway, Sister M M, The Prosodic Theory of Gerard Manley Hopkins 200
- Jeremy, Sister M, Caxton's Original Additions to the *Legenda Aurea* 239
- Jessen, M R, Ein Berliner 'Sperl' bei Fontaine 391
- Johnson, Maurice, The Ghost of Swift in *Four Quartets* 273
- Jones, C W, Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England 192
- Jones, S W, see Gudzy, N K
- Joseph, Sister M, Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language 120
- Juergensen, H, Die Mutter in Adalbert Stifters Werken 483
- Kassner, R, Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert 430
- Keeler, L, Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers, 1300 1500 215
- Kelley, M, Daniel Skinner, Lord Preston, and Milton's Common place Book 522
- Kirby, T A, Further Seventeenth-Century Chaucer Allusions 81
- Klemm, W, Die Englische Faice im 19 Jahrhundert 139
- Knight, A H J, Heinrich Julius Duke of Brunswick 185
- Knight, G W, The Crown of Life Essays in Interpretation of Shakespeare's Final Plays 137
- Kokeritz, H, 'Out born' in *Ludus Coventriae* 88
- Kristeller, P O, see Cassirer, E.
- Krumpelmann, J T, Lessing's *Faust Fragment* and *Romeo and Juliet* 395
- Kurrelmeyer, W, Wielands Briefwechsel mit Du Vau 361
- Lacey, N, Wordsworth's View of Nature 284
- Lam, G L, see Lewis, W S
- Lang, C Y, A Further Note on Swinburne and Whitman 176, Swinburne on Keats 168
- La Piana, A, Dante's American Pilgrimage 198
- Lapp, J C, Pontus de Tyard and the *Querelle des femmes* 331
- Laverty, C D, A Note on Poe in 1838 174
- Leary, L (ed), Articles on American Literature 67
- Lee, D W, Functional Change in Early English 498
- Le Gentil, G, Fernão Mendes Pinto 194

